FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 065

4 April 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Gromyko Press Conference on U.S. INF Proposals AA 1
TASS Views 'Haste' of U.S. Response to Gromyko AA 17
[Bogachev]
Further Reaction Noted AA 17

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Scientists Biannual Meeting Held in Moscow BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Beglov, Kornilov, Agayants]
Soviet Peace Initiatives CC 1
U.S. 'Escalation in Lies' CC 2
U.S. ABM Plans Decried CC 3
U.S. Interim Arms Proposals CC 4
U.S.-Israel Cooperation Scored CC 6
'International Situation: Questions & Answers' CC 8
[Kachanov, Shishkin, Kovalev, Belyayev]
U.S. on 'Hopeless Path' CC 8
Israeli-Syrian Relations CC 10
Greek Internal, Foreign Affairs CC 14

SOUTH ASIA

Andropov Accepts Invitation To Visit India [AFP] D 1
Gromyko Meets With DRA's Dost in Moscow 1 Apr D 1
Dost Departs for Buenos Aires D 1

EASTERN EUROPE

Hungarian Paper Interviews AUCCTU's Shalayev F 1
[Budapest NEPSZAVA 29 Mar]
Arkipov Confers With Hungary's Marjai F 4
[PRAVDA 30 Mar]
Zagladin Holds Budapest Talks With Kadar, Others F 4

WESTERN EUROPE

West European Reaction to Reagan Proposal Noted G 1
[PRAVDA 4 Apr]
USSR Council of Ministers Congratulates Kohl G 1
[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]
Briefs: CPSU Delegation in Luxembourg G 1

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Zambia's Kaunda Comments on Reagan Meeting J 1
Zimbabwe, PLO Establish Diplomatic Ties J 1
[Bogdanov]
TASS, Camaroon Press Sign Exchange Agreement J 1
[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Author Sentenced for Anti-Soviet Slander R 1
Nonferrous Metallurgy Minister on Press Criticism R 1
[Buzluk in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 19 Mar]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Gas Industry Development, Progress Discussed S 1
Tasks, Shortcomings Highlighted S 1
[PRAVDA 28 Mar]
Official on Plan Fulfillment S 2
Briefs: Ferrous Metallurgy, Oil Plan S 3

GROMYKO PRESS CONFERENCE ON U.S. INF PROPOSALS

LD020843 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 2 Apr 83

[Press conference by Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR foreign minister, in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center in Moscow -- live]

[Text] First of all, I would like to greet the esteemed representatives of the press, radio and television. As for the organization of the press conference, first of all I would like to make a statement -- not a very long one -- about certain questions of the international situation and the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. After that there will be a question and answer session. Those present may put any question and I will try to answer them. The questions may be posed in written form or orally. All of them will have equal validity. If there are no other wishes, we will consider that the mode of organization has been resolved.

What would I like to say at the beginning of my statement? The reason, as it were, for the press conference is the latest speeches by the U.S. President. Not only the latest ones, but mainly the latest ones. He has touched on a number of important questions of the international situation, the United States' and the Soviet Union's policy. He almost never fails to speak about the Soviet Union's policy. This is not the only reason for the press conference. Certain other questions have accumulated that certainly need coverage in the press and on radio and television.

What did the U.S. President draw attention to, first and foremost, in his speeches -- in both his recent speeches, the speech on 30 March and, I would say, the 1 April speech -- if you go by European time? The President said that in its foreign policy the United States, or rather the current U.S. Administration, pursues lofty moral values, seeks to defend and protect the peoples' rights, and seeks to properly defend U.S. interests wherever they might be, in whatever part of the earth these interests might be.

Of course, the American President has had and continues to have his own interpretation of both these and other things. High moral values cannot be defended by a state that is preparing for war, above all nuclear war. Indeed, everyone present and every honest person, if he considers whether it is possible to defend high moral values at the present time and at the same time prepare for a nuclear war that would consume hundreds and hundreds of millions of people -- and many politicians and almost all scientists are now correctly saying that this would be a catastrophe for the whole of earth's civilization. [sentence as heard]

I would go further and say that a government that is preparing for nuclear war at the present time is not entitled to speak about defending high moral values in connection with its foreign policy activities. [Moscow TASS in English at 1350 GMT on 2 April carries a report on Andrey Gromyko's Moscow press conference. The TASS report has been compared with the above Moscow Domestic Service in Russian live broadcast of the press conference and renders the above passage as follows: "...all nuclear war. If one asks whether it is possible to defend lofty moral values and at the same time to engage in preparations for a nuclear war in whose flames hundreds and hundreds of millions of people would die, every honest person will answer in the negative. (new paragraph) A government engaged in preparations of nuclear war, which, as said correctly by many politicians and almost all scientists, would be a catastrophe for the civilisation on earth, has no right to speak about defending lofty moral values in connection with its foreign policy activities...." (rewording for clarity)]

Concerning the defense of American interests, this would be fine if it were a question of defending the United States' legitimate interests and, indeed, what belongs to the United States, but how Washington understands the formula for defending U.S. interests is now widely known -- and in general there are few people in the world who are not familiar with this. In this way it comes out that any corner of the world where Washington simply considers that suitable conditions for the United States to obtain something in the material, political and, even more so, military-strategic regard is declared a place where American interests exist that need to be defended with every force, including military force.

If I were to use concrete facts, this would require much time -- very much time. Let everyone here think only about the Persian Gulf zone and the waters adjacent to the Persian Gulf. Then he will most likely receive a fairly convincing answer to the question of the rights of man, the peoples' rights. [TASS here reads: "...to the question as to how Washington understands 'American interests,' human rights and the rights of people. In itself, the ..." (supplying additional phrase)] In itself, the formula is a good one: The Soviet people, the Soviet nation, our country and leadership, have never objected to the fact that the foreign policy of each state should be steeped, if one can put it that way, by the idea of defending the peoples' rights and, consequently, defending the rights of man.

Since the days of Lenin this demand of the peoples' rights and the rights of man has been an inseparable part of our foreign policy. But we are well aware of how this formula -- not a bad one in itself, even a good one -- is exploited when other interests are dominant in politics -- how the true content of this formula of defending peoples' rights, the rights of man, is emasculated and other demands are substituted -- demands that suit a certain power's political, military-strategic and, not lastly, economic purposes.

What can be said of our foreign policy? Our foreign policy, the Soviet Union's foreign policy, is defined by the congresses of our party, the ruling party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and decisions of the party Central Committee. It is expressed in many of our actions, including the major actions that we would think are familiar to everyone.

It is reflected in our statesmen's speeches on concrete issues of policy, on concrete proposals -- above all in the speeches by Yuriy Valdimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. I think you remember these speeches, most of which were made recently. This is a peaceful policy, a policy of friendship among peoples. It is a policy of noninterference in other states' internal affairs. It is a policy aimed at relaxing tension in the world and eliminating the tension from the international situation. It is aimed at reversing the mindless arms race and, above all, arriving at ways to reduce and limit armaments, which is a good formula, and, subsequently, ways to eliminate armaments. For some reason, in the West the Soviet proposal concerning universal and full disarmament is not currently spoken or written about.

I should emphasize this in front of everyone here: After the end of the World War II the Soviet Union proposed two things that will go down in history in letters of gold -- and it can be said that this has already happened. The first thing concerned the conclusion of an international convention banning the application and use of nuclear weapons in perpetuity. Second, the Soviet Union proposed full and universal disarmament.

It emerged that other states intended to drag out deciding the question of disarmament, on various pretexts -- how to precisely define ratios, how to approach reductions in weapons of one type or another, and how to combine all this. Under the pretext of complexity they began to frustrate the solution of this task. The Soviet Union proposed: Let us cut short the disputes. Let us work toward full and universal disarmament.

Then our partners began to ask how can we implement full and universal disarmament without being convinced that it is being implemented in practice? In other words, they raised the question of control, [here and throughout paragraph TASS renders "control" as "verification"] thinking that here the Soviet Union could be leaned on and made to feel uncomfortable. The Soviet Union then proposed full and universal control. Full and universal disarmament must be combined with full and universal control. This proposal of ours remains in force today. I repeat: In the West it is not customary to write about this. A pity! Yet the reason it is not written about is more or less understandable: It is difficult to underline the importance of full and universal disarmament and control while at the same time pursuing a policy of preparing for war, implementing the arms race, escalating military budgets and so on.

I should like to stress these two things at the very beginning. Further, I should like to tell those present that recently the Soviet Union proposed steps that nobody has the right to ignore without acknowledging their own feebleness, if you like, and unconditional, open -- I repeat: open -- adherence to militarist policy.

What are these steps? First, the Soviet Union has unilaterally pledged that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. It did not wait for other powers' agreement to this. This step is resolute and bold. I think that everyone present will probably agree with this. The other powers are not even making the slightest move in this direction and yet the Soviet Union pledges not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Yes, it is a bold, peace-loving step. In the West they are not very keen on covering this problem. That is a pity.

Second, at the session of the Consultative Political Committee the Soviet Union and its friends and allies in the Warsaw Treaty adopted a decision to propose a treaty to the NATO countries on the conclusion of an agreement between the two groups -- NATO and the Warsaw Treaty -- not to use nuclear weapons or conventional weapons. That is, not to use force in relations between states.

Why should such a proposal be made in this form? Because in the West there has been very much demagoguery regarding the fact that the Soviet Union might attack one state or another or a group of states -- that it could carry out aggression, and not necessarily with nuclear weapons. It could do this using conventional weapons. I repeat: Of course, this was demagoguery. But uninformed people, people who are not experienced in foreign policy issues, could be misled by this. The Warsaw Treaty countries' proposals knock out the argument -- knock our opponents' [protivniki] argument completely out of hand.

Even today we are ready to sit with the NATO countries at the negotiating table, discuss this issue and, even better, sign the relevant document. The treaty would be an agreement to make mutual obligations not to use force against each other. How they react -- I think those here have a general idea of how the countries of the North Atlantic alliance, the NATO countries, react to this proposal of ours.

Most of them give us replies of this sort -- that this proposal is being studied. But how much time has passed, and still it is being studied. Not so long ago, I was in West Germany. Chancellor Kohl and Foreign Minister Genscher also declare that this proposal is being studied. So it is in the other countries, and this is what the governments of the other countries also say.

There is a somewhat different reaction from American statesmen. They are not giving an official, final, negative response; they are holding back from that. We have the impression that this is a tactical consideration. From the separate hints which are being made, one can draw the conclusion that this proposal is not to Washington's liking. We are sorry if this is the case; one would like to express the hope that this proposal by the Warsaw Treaty countries will find understanding, will be attentively examined.

If there are any questions to be put to us, we are ready to meet together to examine these questions, and perhaps they will be removed or (?taken into consideration). Perhaps there are some sort of amendments; we are ready to discuss these amendments together. Perhaps following discussion, they or some of them, will be accepted. Perhaps there are proposals on improving some of the formulations concerning the various parties' pledges -- we are also ready to exchange views on these matters. Perhaps the exchange of views will lead to the treaty's being amended, but in the end a common language will have been found.

Comrades and gentlemen, here one has two things. If there is the will for peace, there is no convincing argument against accepting this proposal. Just think. This is a proposal that there should be no war, that one state or group of states should not use force against another state or another group of states. Can there really be any sensible objection to this proposal if people, if mankind wish to live in peace? No. There can be no sensible objections. This is confronted by the course toward the arms race, the course toward the militarization of the economy and life as a whole, the course toward preparation of war. And only that. Only that. We address our proposal, a proposal which, we say, expresses the will of the peoples of the socialist states, to the governments and, of course, to the peoples and appeal to them to weigh everything up and to come to final conclusion. And this proposal which we have made will be recorded in gold letters in the history of international relations.

Certain questions of nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons in the global sense -- strategic nuclear armaments -- and European nuclear weapons, medium-range nuclear weapons -- have now, of course, come to the forefront. They are now in the focus of international life. The peoples, politicians and public figures in Europe, the United States, Canada and other countries are actively concerned with them because all the peoples and politicians realize what kind of questions these are: what their influence is, how they could be resolved or fail to be resolved, and what this entails.

I would like to dwell on questions of nuclear weapons in Europe in connection with the talks being held between the USSR and the United States and on how we perceive the near future and how we assess the current situation with regard to this. One would first and foremost like to emphasize the incorrectness of assertions being made in Washington that, in general, serious talks are underway in Geneva; that there are no major problems and that the thing is to put pressure on the Soviet Union, to harden the position, and then things will start rolling. They even go further and say: The more pressure we put on the USSR, the greater the chance of reaching an accord. This is reflected in concrete proposals which are being proposed during the course of these talks. These statements contain a great deal of untruths, false assertions, cheating and juggling with the facts, in as much as what we are dealing with is factual data, and it is necessary to dwell on this question.

Above all, it is essential to dwell upon an assertion which has been formulated with the greatest precision in the recent statements by the American President, the assertion alleging that his proposals regarding medium-range missiles are the way toward an agreement and the way toward peace.

No. This is an incorrect assertion. This is not the way to peace and not the way to agreement. The gap between agreement and these proposals will become even wider.

Does everyone all know that the President is leaving aside entire components of huge scale and significance? He leaves them aside and does not touch on them. This refers to aviation, aircraft which are nuclear weapons carriers. They are missing in the President's statements and reasoning. Neither political nor military figures have the right to exclude this component from the talks and from the agreement.

What difference does it make to people whether they die from a nuclear charge delivered by a missile or a nuclear charge delivered by an airplane? Is it not well known that what was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was dropped from an airplane? But now more terrible weapons exist which can be delivered by aircraft. How can this entire component be excluded?

The delegations in Geneva tried to discuss this question. They approached it. However, nothing emerged from this discussion. Why? Because the American representatives have instructions not to reach agreement on this question. For example, I will cite this example: You see, they say there are medium-range aircraft which can deliver both nuclear weapons and completely peaceful objects. They can have both a military purpose and a peaceful purpose. Therefore, they cannot be included in the number of nuclear weapons carriers. But it is the same if somebody said that the most powerful, terrible -- let us say ground-based -- ballistic missile can be described in this way: true, it can deliver a nuclear charge but it can also be used for meteorological aims. And therefore, it is better not to include it in the number of those which deliver nuclear charges.

Therefore, it is absurd -- yes, completely absurd -- but indeed, the official representatives expressing the opinion of the United States Government declare such a position.

Further, in the West they hardly ever write about this, and they do not write about it at all in the United States of America. The United States possesses aircraft carriers, and sea-borne aircraft. There are many aircraft carriers, or groups of aircraft carriers, in the United States. According to the figures, which are widely known, there are at least six of them. They have taken a liking to Europe, being stationed either in the waters of Europe, in the Mediterranean sea, or around it. They could cross any line dividing the European waters from the non-European ones in minutes, in seconds if you like. This is a huge force, each carrier containing at least about 40 aircraft carrying nuclear weapons, nothing other than nuclear weapons.

So surely we, the Soviet Union, are not to shut our eyes to this, and not count them. It is absurd. The intentions of a government that suggests that we close our eyes and not see this, are not serious. Therefore, any proposal which excludes the whole, one could say terrible, component of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles, such as aviation, is not a serious proposal. And one cannot look for an agreement on this basis.

The second, important element of the picture -- and one needs to know this, otherwise one would get muddled because so many words are said, so many statements made, that without knowing the specifics, one has to know at least a minimum. Without knowing this minimum, one might get muddled; without wishing to, of course. Britain and France have weapons, missiles, nuclear missiles. The Soviet Union proposes to include them in the talks. One cannot close one's eyes to them, reckoning them as if they did not exist, and only agreeing on American weapons. For these missiles themselves are part of the overall forces of the North Atlantic alliance. How many declarations have been made of this? Hundreds, thousands, if you will, of declarations of the most solemn nature, including one recently during the talks in Geneva, have been made. It was declared in Geneva that, yes, the nuclear forces of Britain and France are an integral part of the nuclear forces of the United States, of the nuclear forces of NATO as a whole. It is being proposed that we seek agreement leaving aside these nuclear forces. Not a serious proposal.

Imagine that a terrible tragedy has occurred: A British missile, say, is flying with nuclear warheads. What then, do you do? Perhaps hang a label on it saying I am British? But if it is to drop its charge people are still going to get killed as from any other missile. A French one is flying. It may also be flying with a label saying: I am French -- you do not count me. Absurd, it will kill people just the same as any other one. Therefore, these missiles -- both the English ones and the French ones need to be taken into account in the overall number. This is the only approach that is justified in the political respect, in the military-strategic respect, in the scientific respect, in the technical respect, and, however you will, the only correct approach. It would seem that this is as clear as could be. But, even up to now the position has not been changing and has not changed judging by the latest statements of the American President.

Further -- this is also clearly reflected in the statements referred to -- the demand is made: Well, if we are talking about any reduction of missiles in Europe, bear in mind that it is not enough to reduce and abolish those missiles in Europe. It is necessary to abolish the corresponding class of missiles in Asia as well. Why Asia all of a sudden? Asia was previously absent. They must be abolished in Asia, too! It is necessary to say that this too, by itself -- and this alone makes accord impossible.

On what grounds is Asia brought in? We concede, as Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov said in introducing the relevant proposal -- which is well known -- we concede that we might transfer -- I repeat, if an agreement were reached -- some of our missiles from Europe, from the European zone to Asia. That is our affair and our right. And we are willing to put them in an area from which they will not reach central Europe. And we have said this in the course of the talks. The American Administration know this. I repeat: We will transfer them to an area from which they will not reach the central European countries. We are told: No, that is not enough. All the arguments of the American Administration, and of the President personally, are to the effect that these missiles must also be abolished. Take that demand alone, and it already excludes the possibility of agreement.

These missiles pose no threat to the countries of Europe. But why are they needed? The Soviet Union needs them in order to make itself secure. After all, it is well known by what ring of military bases the Soviet Union is encircled by the United States.

Japan and the waters surrounding Japan are stuffed full of nuclear weapons and the corresponding launchers [nositeli]. The island of Okinawa is an enormous nuclear weapons base. South Korea is an enormous base, or more precisely a complex of nuclear weapons bases. The Indian Ocean, especially the Diego Garcia base, is stuffed full of nuclear weapons capable of reaching the Soviet Union. The Persian Gulf and adjacent waters are stuffed full of nuclear weapons.

And what is more -- take note, I ask you to pay attention -- that it is a matter of medium-range weapons. All these weapons are capable of reaching Soviet territory. Moreover -- and if anyone is unaware of this, then what I am about to say will probably be of special interest -- moreover, they cover all of Siberia, all of the Asian part of the Soviet Union. Even the northernmost part, the island [as heard] of Taymyr, is also covered.

What is more, we are only talking about medium-range weapons. We do not mean strategic weapons in this context, which exist and are deployed in the same areas I have been mentioning. Strategic weapons are controlled by another agreement, by a provisional agreement, but so far, in effect, the parties have reached agreement on extending the period of operation of this agreement. Consequently, we are only talking about medium-range weapons. These weapons cover the entire Asian territory of the Soviet Union. So the question arises: Can it be that the Soviet Union does not have the right, for purposes of defense -- for purposes of defense -- to have something to oppose these weapons? It does have the right.

They do not pay attention to all of this, do not mention it publicly and do not tell the truth to the people. If the truth were told and explained to the people on each one of these questions, we are sure that there would be a change in opinion and it would probably not be to the advantage of the government and the [TASS here supplies a U.S."] administration which ignore these aspects and facts. They simply do not speak -- they simply do not speak about this. They do not speak of it in the press; they do not speak of it on the radio; they do not speak of it on television. They pass over it in silence.

And if you take the United States, they hear only one thing from morning to night: The Soviet Union is a threat -- the Soviet Union is a threat -- it is not moving toward agreement; it submits a proposal which is not in accordance with the United States' line.

However, factual material, even factual material for a person to reflect on, is not provided. This may sound sharp, but it is impossible to keep from saying that in general the population is being presented with deceitful propaganda. This idea which is being formed in people who, through no fault of their own, are poorly informed, is distorted, totally distorted.

As for the assertion that the more pressure put on the Soviet Union, the greater the chances of agreement is concerned, this is also completely lacking in substance. It is possible to explain it to a certain extent by lack of knowledge of the Soviet Union -- lack of knowledge of our character, if you like -- but the proposal is not serious and is not designed to create the possibility of agreement. This is what we think, that it is not designed to promote agreement.

Therefore, without knowing how they will regard this in Washington, we call for a more objective approach to this matter, for a more objective renunciation of unilateralism, taking into account all factors, taking into account the legitimate interests and and security of the Soviet Union; and we call for a line to be taken toward agreement, toward rapproachement [sblizheniye] with the Soviet Union. The line the United States is currently taking at the talks is not a line toward rapproachement, but a line moving away from agreement, a line of complicating the situation, a line toward spiraling the arms race even further, in order to further worsen relations with the Soviet Union, in order to achieve an even greater increase in military budgets, in order to even further fetter those forces which stand for finding a common language with the Soviet Union and for resolving the problems of disarmament.

Incidentally, from time to time Washington, and first and foremost the representatives of the administration, talk about the United States' move for a freeze of nuclear weapons allegedly being almost inspired by the Soviet Union. Or they say it might be inspired or it might be led by the Soviet Union. One way or the other we must point out the absurdity of such an assumption, the absurdity of such statements, in the most categorical manner. This movement is a spontaneous American movement. The Soviet Union has nothing to do with the fact that this movement is based on a desire to promote the finding of a common language with the Soviet Union, or that it desires to fetter the forces preparing for war -- militaristic forces. We can only express solidarity with this movement, because we are of a like mind regarding the prevention of war and the need for agreement, for a search for agreements and understandings [dogovorennosti] on these issues.

One cannot charge either the movement or us that there is some kind of unified center for which responsibility is to be borne by the Soviet Union or the leaders of that movement. We shall hope that those reproaches will not live long and that they will be dispelled; and that the people who understand -- intensely, one may say -- what corresponds to the interests of the American people and what does not, that they will even more effectively and with an even louder voice show and make themselves felt in the political life of the United States.

So, in conclusion, in view of the latest pronouncements, chiefly the President's, we can say that the so-called interim solution -- which is what the President called his idea -- is unacceptable. It is unacceptable for the following reasons: First, it does not take the British and French medium-range nuclear weapons, including 162 missiles, into account; second, it does not take many hundreds of American nuclear weapon carrying aircraft based in Western Europe and on aircraft carriers into account; and third, Sovie medium-range missiles in the Soviet [as heard] part of the USSR would be dismantled [likvidatsiya] even though they have no relation to Europe. [Here TASS reads:"...] Thirdly, the Soviet medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the USSR would also be subject to liquidation although they do not have relation to Europe..." (rewording for clarity)]

As a whole, if NATO now has a 1 and 1/2 superiority in medium-range nuclear warheads [boyezaryady] in Europe, then in the event of the implementation of the President's interim option, NATO would have almost 2 and 1/2 times as many such warheads as the Soviet Union has.

That, in a concentrated form, is our attitude on the American Administration's so-called interimediate proposal. Moreover, we do not doubt the fact that Washington did not count on a different reaction from us. We have reasons for this.

Before ending my statement I would like to draw the attention of those present to two circumstances, without which the picture would probably be incomplete -- from the viewpoint of the people who provide the news today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow understanding the situation as a whole, at any rate. This would be useful for people.

Once and for all everyone should remember that not one of our weapons, that is our missile armaments, in Europe will reach U.S. territory. This task, of course, is not being set. That is a different matter. The missiles cannot reach and are not capable of reaching the United States. In the case of the American weapons that are to be deployed in Europe, each missile can reach the Soviet Union's territory. That is a factor of geography. In whose favor does this factor operate? It operates in favor of the United States and to the detriment of the Soviet Union.

We are not asking for compensation for this and we are not raising this question. But in order to scrupulously and precisely work out of the balance we could raise the question of compensation.

Further, a missile is a missile and a missile flies. Well, now, the flight time for an American missile from Western Europe to Soviet territory is roughly six to seven times shorter than the flight time of a missile from the territory of the Soviet Union to the United States in the event of a terrible tragedy befalling mankind.

The Soviet Union also has to scrupulously and precisely approach and construct an appropriate equation for observing the principle of equality. It also has the right and would have the right to set the question of compensation. But we are not setting this question and we are withdrawing this factor, as it were, into parenthesis. Why? In the interests of making the path to agreement easier -- in these interests. Furthermore, we consider that if agreement were reached, it would then be evident that steps had been taken toward further, more radical reductions and perhaps -- who knows? -- to the complete eradication of missiles weapons. To the complete eradication of missile weaponry.

I also ask you to bear this circumstance in mind: Here we are displaying extreme flexibility -- even magnanimity, if you like -- in the interests of agreement, bearing in mind, as I have already said, that the aim that has to be sought, that the world has to seek, is the complete eradication of nuclear weapons and the application of nuclear energy for purely peaceful aims and purely for the good of humanity. Our policy in these questions, questions of both medium-range weapons and strategic weapons outside the confines of Europe, is to preserve the equality -- the principle of equality -- come what may. This has come about over a period of many years.

You could say that life itself has brought the principle of equality into being. It is not the result of any mere bureaucratic labors. Life itself. We are for preservation. U.S. policy is directed toward breaking, demolishing, that principle. We will do all to observe that principle, whether an agreement is achieved or not.

If the principle is violated as a result of action by the U.S. Government and NATO, then the Soviet Union would most certainly -- and no one can waver and no one can have any doubts -- take steps to guard its legitimate interests and see that the principle continues to operate.

That we will do. That we will do. We have the material and intellectual capability -- of that there can be no doubt. We think that, in fact, even those who bear the guilt for the present situation know that, too.

There I conclude my statement. If there are any questions, please ask them and I will try to answer them. [Except where otherwise noted, all questions are asked in Russian by an unidentified speaker. All questions are answered in Russian by Gromyko.]

[Question] A question from IZVESTIYA political observer Matveyev: It seems that Washington is still calculating that as the end of the year, when the deployment of American missiles in Europe is planned, approaches the USSR will be more compliant. What can you say about this?

[Answer] This is not a correct viewpoint. It is a profoundly mistaken one. This is such an exposure, you know, of the tactics, the tactical aspect, which shows that in point of fact people think too little. This cannot be the situation. On the contrary, the United States and the Soviet Union will be further from an agreement than now -- all the further from an agreement. [as heard] Therefore, the information media -- the press, radio and television -- will do a good service if they speak the truth and say that an agreement requires accord, consideration for the legitimate interests of both sides and observance of the principle of equality.

[Question] A question from American ABC television company correspondent (Walter Rogers): What will the Soviet Union's response be if the Americans deploy the Pershing and cruise missiles. Will the installation of these missiles be in any way similar to the Cuban nuclear missile crisis of 1962?

[Answer] In my statement I said that if this occurs, if the missiles are installed and an agreement is foiled and there is no accord, the Soviet Union would endeavor in material and other ways to guard its interests. We will not permit the parity -- or the balance, if you like to call it that -- to be upset. [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 April 1983 First Edition carries on pages 4 and 5 Gromyko's press conference. The report in PRAVDA entitled "A.A. Gromyko's Press Conference" has been compared with the above Moscow Domestic Service in Russian live broadcast of the press conference and here inserts the additional sentence: "We will not permit it."] With us there will be no divergence between word and deed. We do possess the possibilities. We do possess the possibilities and we have repeatedly proved this. But that is the worse course. It would be a forced measure on our part. Our first and preferred position is that the issue be resolved on the basis of an accord with the United States and NATO.

[Question] A question from Mikhaylov, member of the editorial board of the newspaper PRAVDA: The Soviet Union upholds the principle of equality and identical security. The U.S. side, on the other hand, speaks of the principle of equal rights and limits. What is the difference between the two?

[Answer] If you had asked the U.S. representatives who are negotiating what the formula equal rights and equal limits means they would not have given you an answer. They would have given you a completely feeble answer -- made a feeble statement -- because they themselves do not know what it means. One can guess that at the center of this is the question of the British and French missiles, their limits and rights. We are now told: If you don't mind, the British and French missiles are not American ones, and it is the Americans who are conducting talks with the Soviet Union. How can we include them and resolve questions relating to them?

One can assume that the point at issue here is the British and French missiles. This stems from certain remarks -- from the logic, so to speak, of the talks. But this formula has been specially devised to confuse the issue. Imagine, please, asking the first person you meet on the street: Do you know what the phrase identical rights and identical limits, which the Americans are upholding, means? What does this formula, which they are going by, mean? He would just shrug his shoulders and say nothing. Furthermore, I would say that if an intelligent, cultured, educated person were to sit at the negotiating table -- or even a short distance from it -- he would also be unable to say.

The mathematically and politically precise formula that is acceptable from a military-strategic point of view is equality -- equality and identical security, taking all factors into account. For example, I have already spoken about Central Asia and a few other things. All factors: This is a simple but scientifically grounded formula.

[Question] A question from (Samuel Rachlin), correspondent for Denmark's radio and television. Mister Minister, you have recently stated that the public in the West would be deluding itself if it thought the Geneva talks would continue despite the deployment of new missiles. Does this mean that the Soviet Union will break off the talks the moment the first American missile is deployed?

[Answer] I should tell you that this fact will be a very negative one for Europe and the world as a whole. The position will be such that we will be bound to reexamine it as attentively as possible, and, taking all circumstances into consideration -- I emphasize this, taking all circumstances into account -- arrive at a relevant decision.

[Question] A question from (Devi Murarka), correspondent for the Finnish papers AAMULEHTI and HUFVUDSTADSBLADET: Mister Foreign Minister, in his latest speeches President Reagan has termed the USSR as an empire and center of evil. How do you appraise these assertions?

[Answer] Yes, we are aware that the American President is prone to such turns of phrase, that he organizes a crusade or forecasts it -- but organizes rather than just forecasts it. Now he proclaims the USSR to be the center of evil. Well, it is not as if he were the first in history to do so. History has had instances of statesmen whose approach to this was to forecast the demise of socialism when socialist science was in its infancy. Then, when socialist states were formed they forecast the demise of socialism. As for socialism, it proceeds along its own way. Simple mathematics testify to this, as well as some other things, too. It proceeds, gathering strength, and this is a legitimate way.

We do not think these forecasts will add to the authority of American foreign policy. We do not think they will shake socialism, its foundations, or our foreign policy by even one iota. It is our conviction that never in the period since World War II has the USSR's star, our banner, and the banner of our foreign policy shone as brightly as it does today for the whole world -- in the North, the South, the West, and the East.

As for the liquidation of colonialism, would it, generally speaking, have been at all possible without the USSR and our victory in the war against the fascist aggressors? No, not a single discriminating, reasoning, and clever person would say that.

Our theory and ideology are founded on the acknowledgement of the objective laws of the development of human society. We are convinced that what has been accomplished by socialism, the socialist states and, above all, the Soviet Union is a granite foundation for future activity -- a foundation that serves our people well as they go forward to fulfill their plans and serves as an example for all mankind.

It serves as an example. Noninterference in the internal affairs of other states is one of the principles of our foreign policy. But an example is an example, you cannot liquidate it. Even if somebody goes on a crusade he cannot liquidate it. I repeat: We do not think that will increase the opportunities for U.S. foreign policy. You know, these insults, these strong words that the leaders in Washington practice and love to practice, only demonstrate, you know, what threshold of decorum Washington has adopted in conducting affairs with other states, especially with the Soviet Union -- just how they conduct affairs.

Just how do they conduct affairs? Imagine the corresponding U.S. and Soviet representatives meeting at the negotiating table and exchanging such words. Some would try to prove that, you know, you are the center of evil, and the others would, of course, give a rebuff and try not to be outdone. What sort of talks would that be? What sort of talks would that be? If someone were to start compiling a table of evil -- a table of indices for evil -- I assure you that this table would be hundreds of times longer for the United States.

Those who are harmed by the United States, those on whose feet the United States is stepping by proclaiming whole territories and dozens of countries to be the zone of U.S. interests -- almost the United States' backyard or own lake -- appeal to us to defend their legitimate interests. They appeal to us. Well, what is this then? Do they appeal to the center of evil? Nothing of the kind. Well then was it the center of evil that put forward proposals at the United Nations for the liquidation of colonialism and the colonial system? This was put forward by a socialist state, the USSR. This is an open book. Everyone can read it.

Was it the center of evil that as long ago as in 1946 proposed an international convention proclaiming that nuclear weapons are incompatible with mankind's conscience and providing for a ban on nuclear weapons and for turning nuclear power to peaceful pruposes for the benefit of mankind? What was it, then, the center of evil? No, it was the Soviet socialist state. Then is it the center of evil that is now proposing to curtail military budgets, to pledge not to use force among states -- that is to say, to prevent war and build relations upon a peaceful foundation? Is this the center of evil? No, it is a state that bears the policy of peace and friendship among peoples.

We do not impose our ideology on anyone. Our ideology is a reflection of what is objectively taking place in human society. If I were to enlarge on this more, in all probability someone would say that this is propaganda. But there is propaganda and propaganda. Surely you would not agree, all of you present here, to being called -- on and all -- simply propagandists, but to some extent you are propagandists since you disseminate information among people, and there is information and information that opens up people's eyes. This is the truth, and the strength of our policy lies in truth.

That is why the President's or someone else's exercises in attaching labels, such as the center of evil, in picking all kinds of spicy words is a thankless task, and neither it is a viable one. It is not a viable one. It may well be that it will shine for someone who happens to stand or sit near the President, but it will wither without fail. We are proud of the role being fulfilled by the Soviet state and we know that there are many states, the majority of states in the world, which give due appraisal to this role. We are proud. We are in the great struggle of peoples for peace and against nuclear war. We have in this respect many partners, if you like, and many allies.

[Question] A question from TASS observer Bogachev: What is concealed behind the American proposal concerning the global limitation of medium-range missiles?

[Answer] You probably have the United States' proposals or demands to eliminate missiles in the Asian part of the USSR in mind. I have already spoken on this subject in connection with the question concerning the possibility of reducing Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe and the possibility -- and our right -- of transferring some of the missiles to the Asian part of the USSR's territory. I said that the United States has put forward proposals that the missiles should be eliminated, and not just in the European part, but also in the Asian part. And all the same, the proposal put forward by the President concerning the sharp reduction of Soviet missiles encompasses also the Asian part. If we translate all this into concrete language, it would mean that the United States would then have almost 2 and 1/2 times more warheads. [boyezaryad]. Why do I say warheads and not missiles? Because warheads is more precise. Mathematically it is a more precise expression of, well, the power of nuclear weapons, to use a word that is in common currency.

[Question] In your view, is the interim version proposed by President Reagan now a way of really seeking a solution to the problem, or does it pursue some sort of other aims, perhaps propagandist or some other aims?

[Answer] We definitely think that it pursues other aims. And these other aims are that the United States, the American Administration, to be more precise, has set itself the task of achieving at all costs the deployment in West Europe of additional types of nuclear weapons and not allowing any agreements. This is the real aim.

[Question, in English] (Stewart Parker), Cable News network: I take it from everything that you said in your statement here and your response to the IZVESTIYA question, that you see no hope at all... [at this point the question in English becomes inaudible under the now superimposed Russian translation] In replying to IZVESTIYA you said that there is no hope of reaching an agreement with the United States on medium-range missiles before the end of the year. First, is this assertion correct? Second, connected with this question, you have just been appointed first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers. Does this mean that you will be spending less time on foreign affairs and what will be your responsibilities as first deputy premier?

[Question, given again in Russian] Representative of the American company, Cable News: I have two questions. As I understand it from the reply, from your reply to the question from the IZVESTIYA correspondent, you, in essence, do not feel any hope about the possibility of reaching an agreement on intermediate-range missiles [promezhutochnoy dalnosti] before the end of this year. Do I understand the position correctly? And my second question: You were recently appointed first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Does this mean that you will now be spending less time on foreign affairs, and what will your additional responsibilities be in this connection?

[Answer] So, the first question.

[Question given again in Russian] Would it be correct to suppose that there is no hope of the possibility of reaching an agreement on medium-range missiles before the end of the year?

[Answer] This is how I would answer the first question: If the position of the United States of America is to be as it has been announced, then there are no chances of agreement. Therefore, it would be a good thing if the American Administration adopted a more objective position in keeping with the requirement of preserving the principle of equality and equal security and full consideration of the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union and of all states of the Warsaw Pact.

Regarding your second question, it concerns me personally. I could, indeed, refrain from answering it, but I would say that I very much doubt that there will be less work in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. [laughter] Rather, I think there will be more work, and it will concern the increased volume of work of coordinating -- to put it briefly -- foreign political activity.

[Question] A question from (Banko Stosec), correspondent of the Yugoslav press agency TANJUG: Esteemed Andrey Andreyevich, despite the United States' position, do you consider an improvement in Soviet-American relations to be possible? Do you believe that, in general, in the next few years it will be possible to reach an agreement between the USSR and the United States?

[Answer] He has asked a very easy question. I shall just say one thing: We would like relations between the United States and the USSR to improve. How many times have statements on this theme come from our side -- from the rostrums of the party congresses, the USSR Supreme Soviet and Central Committee plenary meetings. Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov has also spoken on this. I repeat: We would like this. But it is clear that the U.S. Administration does not want an improvement in relations with the USSR. It wants the USSR to make radical concessions to the detriment of its legitimate interests -- its legitimate and justified interests. This has not happened and it never will.

Therefore, we would appeal to the United States to adopt a more objective approach to questions of Soviet-U.S. relations and to understand that normal, and, what would be even better, good relations between the United States and the USSR are in accord with the interests not only of the world situation as a whole, but also the interests of the American people. In the past we have frequently said that this would be in accord with the interests of the Soviet people.

In order to prevent war, primarily nuclear war, it is first of all necessary to change the nature of relations between the USSR and the United States for the better. We are in favor of this. The U.S. Administration does not want this. It is not inappropriate to recall that we were once wartime allies. That means that we found common ground for cooperation at that time, even though our states had different social systems and different ideologies. We consider that two powers - powers with vast military potential -- can arrange normal relations in spite of these differences in social system and ideology. We are sure that the peoples of the two countries, the USSR and the United States, would breathe more easily for this.

[Question] A question from (Gupta), correspondent of the Indian agency PRESS TRUST OF INDIA: Would you be so kind as to describe the nature of the proposals that, as is reported, you made to the Chinese side last month in order to promote the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations.

[Answer] I shall speak in very general terms. Consultations have begun between China and the USSR. The objects of the consultations are many questions. They have not yet gone far enough to draw definite conclusions, and all the more so on the major questions. The sides have agreed to continue the consultations. The atmosphere during the consultations is normal on the whole. The consultations will be continued. We consider it a good thing that they have begun and will continue. We shall see what happens next. We are in favor of normal relations with China.

[Question] A question from correspondents of the Bulgarian newspaper RABOTNICHESKO DELO, (Rorninski) and (Koseva): Washington continues to claim that the Soviet Union is not observing the unilateral moratorium it announced on the deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the USSR. What can you say on that?

[Answer] I can answer that briefly. It is a fraudulent [obmannoye] statement. There is no divergency in the words and deeds of the Soviet Union. That applies in this case too. That is all.

[Question] A question from (Bernard), American television company NBC News: Yuriy Andropov said that there are solutions that will not infringe upon the interests of either of the sides. However, your position seems inflexible. Will the Soviet Union agree to any new deployment of missiles?

[Answer] We, in the course of talks, have expressed our opinion and we have heard the opinion of the United States. I have spoken about the basic policy lines in these talks, both ours and those of the United States. What is now known about U.S. policy excludes the possibility of accord. We do not know about tomorrow, but the apparent, visible prospect is not very good, if only because the American position is already being drawn up now, and it applies to the future, too. It is being specially emphasized that missiles, according to schedule, are to be deployed -- are to be, are to be, are to be -- it is maintained every hour, every day. One would like to see a change for the better, but for the time being it is not evident.

[Question] A question from a correspondent of the Hungarian newspaper NEPSZABADSAG, (Medvedszky): The United States, according to President Reagan, considers effective verification one of the basic principles of any agreement on arms control. What is the fundamental position of the Soviet Union on this question?

[Answer] Esteemed representatives of the media, I want to stress most decisively that verification has never been a bottleneck in the implementation of agreements or talks during agreements [as heard], although we have heard from the other side a great deal of demagogy on this subject, especially outside the framework of the negotiations table. [Here TASS renders Gromyko's answer as follows: ... "I would like to stress most emphatically that for the Soviet Union verification has never been a bottle-neck in the compliance with agreements, or in negotiations on agreements, although we have heard from the other side very many demogogic statements on this score, especially beyond the framework of the negotiating table ...." (recording for clarity)] Whenever verification is necessary, we are for verification. Where there is no need for special verification, well, that means there should not be any and there is no need for it. Both sides agreed on this, incidentally, meaning, of course, the United States and the Soviet Union.

Let me stress, many people possibly do not know that since it is a question of certain treaties -- in particular the SALT II treaty, which because of the actions of the American side did not come into force and was not ratified -- much was based on bilateral, independent national verification, bilateral in the sense that each side, or rather both sides, acted in his own way on this question. Bilateral, not joint, but precisely national verification.

And there were no serious criticisms of any kind. This suited both sides. Now, it is sometimes said that there are doubts -- incidentally, they do not say to us directly that violations actually take place -- that there are doubts about how far various obligations undertaken by the Soviet Union are being observed. If we are talking about doubts, we, too, have more than once expressed doubts to the Government of the United States. We have expressed them, yes. So as not to make unsubstantiated statements, I will cite one instance. In the course of the talks -- it was necessary to conduct them with restraint and honesty -- we suddenly notice that for some time certain objects in the United States are being concealed from observation. We raise a question. We are told: Yes, they are being concealed; we are being hindered by the weather. A month or two passes, even more. We raise the question again: Certain objects are being concealed. They must not be concealed. So that we may see them with the means at our disposal, they must not be concealed at all. It was agreed that they must not be concealed. We get the answer: Look, it's raining. It's raining. We have to cover them. Well, of course we, half seriously, half ironically, ask: When are these covers of yours coming off? Have you had rain for months on end?

What is this, the second flood? It was a ruse, of course. But we took it fairly calmly, and it didn't happen again. There were other cases, too. But we don't want to exploit that for propaganda. We admit that in some secondary matters there may be something of the kind, but there was nothing serious from our side. We do not intend -- it is not a feature of our policy -- to enshrine one thing in a treaty or agreement and then act in another way. If the United States behaved the same it would be a good thing.

[Question] A question from (Faruq), a correspondent for the Syrian newspaper AL-BA'TH: How do you assess the situation which has now come about in the Near East? How do you assess Washington's reaction to the Soviet Government statement on the essence of Israel's aggressive schemes against Syria? Have there been contacts recently between the USSR and the United States with regard to the situation in that region?

[Answer] Between the USSR...[(Faruq) interrupts]

[Question] And the United States, yes.

[Answer] [Words indistinct] I should begin with the final point. There are no systematic contacts between the USSR and the United States. If there are such contacts, usually there are mutual representations [predstavleniya], representations, which mean that sparks of electricity fly. It would be better, of course, to conduct matters differently, in a calmer form, but -- one has sometimes to tell the truth, the unpleasant truth, maybe even in a quite sharp form -- how can one speak mildly about what is now going on in the Near East, particularly in Lebanon? How can one speak mildly about what is required of people in terms of nerves and frame of mind not to absorb in the most lively and energetic way, and with great alarm, what is going on? After all, there was a time when, in connection with a certain action, an aggressive action, by Israel toward Lebanon, Washington made a statement: Washington would not send its forces to Lebanon. Some time went by. A statement is made: Yes, by all means, it can send forces, but only for a limited period, if asked. Some time goes by: They appear there, contingents of American forces. Again an official statement is made by the administration. Yes, there are American forces there and Washington, for the time being, is not about to withdraw its forces. It does not have a deadline for withdrawal.

This is the American position, as everyone knows. Washington therefore (?urgently) places its contingents in Lebanon. Or they say: Yes, the Americans will leave Lebanon with their military contingents, but Israel and all other foreign troops must also leave. Then Israel says: I do not intend to leave. And Washington says: Ah, since Israel does not intend to leave, neither do I. I think it is not difficult for these two partners to agree on the division of roles between themselves. Every objective-thinking outside observer draws the correct conclusion: Yes, there is, in fact, collusion. The Soviet Union is in favor of the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of Lebanon, all of them. Syria is in favor of this. Israel does not wish this; it wants to keep a part of Lebanon for itself; it wants to break Lebanon up into parts. This is, generally speaking, a small country, and breaking it up into parts -- what happens? It ceases to exist.

Washington has stated that in the vicinity actually -- a huge region that encompasses 19 countries -- there are states of particular interest to the United States. There are states to which the strategic interests of the United States are spread, and a special command has even been formed. A strategic command center has been set up for these regions. In the list of tasks pursued by Washington is the task of interfering even when certain internal events are taking place that do not suit American interests in these countries.

The Near East is falling [podpadat]. The Near East is falling. What rights exist here? What lofty morals are here? What high moral principles? What can be defended here if one approaches the matter with the objectivity and honesty? If some internal social changes take place in these countries, then Washington gives itself the right to interfere and even use armed force. What is one to call this? I do not wish to use too strong words.

We, of course, sympathize with the Arab cause. We are in favor of peace in the Near East. But at the same time, we are in favor of Israel's existing as a state. No one can reproach us with having changed our position toward Israel as a state. The USSR raised its hand in favor when the question of the fate of Palestine was being discussed -- in favor of the existence, the creation of a special state of Israel. [Here TASS reads: "... in favor of the establishment of an Israeli state side by side with a Palestinian one..." (adding additional phrase)] We continue to think so now.

We do not share the point of view of extremist Arab circles that Israel should be eliminated. This is an unrealistic and unjust point of view. But Israel should be a peace-loving state. It should arrange good and peaceful relations with its neighbors. That is the sort of Israeli state of which we are in favor. Unfortunately, everything that Israel has been doing over a period of many years simply undercuts the basis, the political and historical basis, which was defended in general by all of those who supported the creation of Israel as an independent state. In voting for Israel, we were voting for a peaceful Israel, not for an aggressive Israeli state. Perhaps this will now sound old-fashioned, but all the same I wish that Israel would in the end have healthy realistic tendencies in its policy, in political life, in its political and social life, favoring the idea that Israel would live in peace with its neighbors.

We support the Arabs. We support their just cause. We support the Palestinians and believe they have the right to establish their own independent, albeit small, Palestinian Arab state.

[Question] One more final question, Andrey Andreyevich. There are other questions, but they in one form or another repeat those that have already been presented. A question from the correspondent of the Czechoslovakian newspapers MLADA FRONTA and SMENA ZDENEK: As is known, in February this year the Soviet delegation at the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe submitted a complex of specific proposals on behalf of the socialist countries aimed at breaking the deadlock in the Vienna talks. What was the reaction of the other participating countries? What are the further prospects for the Vienna talks?

[Answer] To begin at the end, the prospects are bad. The prospects are felt to be bad because Washington, London, and other Western participants -- our partners in the talks -- are not devoting serious attention to them, and their positions are firmly cemented. We have several times made approaches from various directions. We have made proposals and shown flexibility in the hope that in the final analysis, things would begin to move. Not so long ago -- only 2 or 3 months ago -- we submitted proposals to simplify the total numbers of troops. We have proposed simplifying this and dismissing any side circumstances. Unfortunately, not much interest was displayed in this, although no official answer has yet been given. This method has been adopted fairly solidly of late in certain Western capitals. We do not have an answer to our proposal and there is no movement in these talks, no movement. There is no movement in a number of other areas concerning talks that have begun and those that should have begun. Our partners do not want to hold talks. On cessation of testing nuclear weapons, we reproach the Western countries -- above all, the U.S. Administration -- which are refusing to reach an agreement on this question, or even to hold talks.

Strange as it may seem, even the Madrid forum has not yet been completed. Yet, given anything like an objective attitude, it should have been completed long ago because the main political framework has already been determined by the Helsinki agreement, the Helsinki Final Act. The concrete questions that arise and have arisen should be resolved in the framework of that basic agreement. If the desire were there, they ought to be resolved. Let us hope that in the end that forum will also be completed with positive results. One would like to believe that it will.

I must thank all those present. I hope that the results of this press conference will be reported objectively. Especially concerning this last wish, I address myself to the representatives of the foreign news media. Thank you. I leave you my best wishes. Goodbye. [applause]

TASS VIEWS 'HASTE' OF U.S. RESPONSE TO GROMYKO

LD041038 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 4 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Reporting about the response by Washington's officials to Andrey Gromyko's press conference, the American press stresses that the Reagan administration's reply was made in an unusual haste. State Department officials in their propagandist fever probably failed even to read carefully the account of the press conference. Otherwise, how can one explain their misinterpretation of the remarks made at the press conference.

According to the American NBC television network, for instance, State Department officials believe that Gromyko's statement is far from being the final response to the U.S. proposals.

Thus, the correspondent of the T.V. company points out, they in Washington believe that although the USSR rejected the American proposals, it may still accept them in the future.

The following words by Andrey Gromyko should be recalled in connection with these declarations by U.S. officials: "If the position of the United States of America remains as it was announced by the President, then there are no chances for an agreement. That is why it would be good if the U.S. Administration adopted a more objective position meeting the need to preserve the principle of equality and equal security, and fully taking into account the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union and of all the states of the Warsaw Treaty."

The calculations by certain circles in the United States on a change in the clear and unambiguous stand of the Soviet Union with regard to Reagan's "interim proposal" are built on sand.

Further Reaction Noted

LD021952 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 2 Apr 83

[Text] Foreign news agencies have transmitted detailed reports -- with the marking: urgent priority -- on the Moscow press conference by Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs.

They single out the assessment that the so-called interim option on medium-range missiles, proposed by U.S. President Reagan, is not acceptable to the Soviet Union for three reasons. First, it does not take into account the British and French medium-range nuclear weapons; second, many hundreds of U.S. nuclear weapon carrying aircraft based in Western Europe and on aircraft carriers are not taken into consideration; third, according to Reagan's plan, the Soviet missiles in the Asian parts of the USSR would be subject to dismantling, although they have no relation to Europe.

The reports of many mass news media, commenting on the press conference in Moscow, note that the USSR policy is a policy of peace, friendship between peoples and noninterference in the internal affairs of other states. This policy is aimed at relieving tension in the world and turning around the senseless arms race.

The U.S. agency ASSOCIATED PRESS reported priority from Moscow on the Gromyko press conference. The Soviet minister stated that the latest proposal from the head of the White House merely undermines the possibility of achieving agreement at the talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, the agency stresses. AP points out that Reagan's proposal would give NATO 2 and 1/2 times more nuclear warheads than the Soviet Union would have.

CEMA SCIENTISTS BIANNUAL MEETING HELD IN MOSCOW

LD020150 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 30 Apr 83

[Text] In half an hour, a forum of scientists from the fraternal socialist countries begins work in Moscow at the building of the CEMA International Institute of Economic Problems of the World Socialist System. Before the opening of this international meeting, our correspondent Konstantin Patsyuk talked with some of the participants.

[Begin recording] [Patsyuk] In this forum, which is being held in relation with the scientific council's session, are representatives of Bulgaria, Hungary, Cuba, GDR, Poland, Mongolia, the USSR and the CSSR. I asked Mark Sergeyevich (Ilyin), scientific secretary of the International Institute, to explain the significance of this forum in the scientific life of the fraternal countries.

[Ilyin] It is now a tradition that we get together twice a year in order to discuss the most interesting reports the institute's scientists have prepared in close cooperation with scientists from the fraternal countries. We exchange views on the intensification of socialist economic integration. This assumes particular importance in the present day conditions, as was particularly noted at our party's 26th congress. All CEMA member-countries have embarked on a consistent path of coordinating their economic policies and of intensifying their social production. So today, we are going to discuss a number of scientific reports, including a report which was prepared at the institute under the supervision of Professor Bautina on the experience gained in improving the national economic mechanisms in the CEMA member-countries and on the conclusions regarding the possible areas where closer cooperation can take place.

[Patsyuk] Another interesting problem which scientists from the fraternal countries are dealing with is cooperation in the sphere of capital investment. Aleksandr Belovic from Czechoslovakia, chief of department and supervisor of research in this subject, explains:

[Belovic] Research in this area is conducted in several directions. One very important direction is the coordination in capital investment among interested CEMA countries. This problem is particularly pertinent today when socialist states, experiencing certain difficulties with respect to material and labor resources, are aiming at pooling their efforts in solving large-scale projects which a single country would not have the capacity to realize. In this respect, it is very important to coordinate the direction of capital investment in order to create production capacities of optimal scale. Definite positive experience has been gained in this matter. I can cite the following example: The Kiyembay Asbestos mining and concentration combine was built on USSR territory with joint effort. The combine has a capacity of 500,000 tons of asbestos per year. This is one of the largest combines of this kind in the world.

[Patsyuk] As becomes apparent from these statements, the range of problems which the scientists from the fraternal countries will present for discussion is quite broad. Solving these problems is ultimately aimed at further intensification of cooperation and integration within the CEMA framework. [end recording]

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD031802 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0842 GMT 3 Apr 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with APN political observer Spartak Beglov, TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov, and all-union radio commentator Nikolay Agayants]

Soviet Peace Initiatives

[Text] [Agayants] Hello, comrades. It can be said without any exaggeration that last week was marked by the intensifying peaceful advance launched by the Soviet Union and the other states in our socialist community, and by a consonant activation of the anti-war movement in the West. This is confirmed in the foreign news agency reports being received here in our editorial office, in the coverage by press, radio and television, and in the statements made by prominent political and public figures in various countries. There is a single concern, a single desire that runs through them all, that everything possible be done in order to curb the insane and unbridled arms race and to prevent a nuclear war.

This is why the attention of world public opinion remains focused on Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's replies to questions put to him by a PRAVDA correspondent. These replies were received everywhere as further clear and convincing evidence of our people's loyalty to the Leninist peaceful foreign policy, and to the principled and consistent course toward alleviating international tension, consolidating the processes of detente, and toward equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee showed in a well-argued manner that the present American Administration is pursuing a dangerous militaristic course that, more than ever before in the entire postwar period of history, is threatening the security of all mankind. This is said, in particular, by RUDE PRAVO in Czechoslovakia, and it goes on -- I quote: Comrade Andropov's replies are a passionate appeal to reason, and a serious warning addressed to those who are trying to push the planet into the abyss of thermonuclear catastrophe.

Our policies enjoy the support of millions of people of good will, wherever they live, whatever views they may hold. This is so because our policies are honest, specific and profoundly realistic. Our policies are always based on a scientific assessment of the consequences of nuclear war, a war for which there is not, and there never could be any justification. Our policies of peace take into account the correlation of forces between socialism and imperialism and their military parity. Our policies are based on the growing moral and political potential of the countries and peoples who want peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems.

[Beglov] It must be noted that this clear and constructive stance was expounded in detail also in Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's statement at the press conference held in Moscow yesterday.

[Kornilov] Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko particularly stressed the continuity and consistency of the peace-loving and purposeful foreign policy of the Soviet country. He reiterated that there are initiatives that will literally be recorded by history in gold letters, and it can be said they already have so entered the history of diplomacy and the history of politics. It was the Soviet Union, he recalled, that once proposed an international convention on the issue of banning forever the application and use of nuclear weapons. It was the Soviet Union that submitted the initiative of general and full disarmament, proposing general and full disarmament. Also the Soviet Union proposed that the measures toward general and full disarmament should be complemented by general and full verification. It is hard to overestimate the importance of these very important initiatives of the Soviet Union.

In the West, incidentally, only very rarely, and then very little, is anything written about these initiatives, in an attempt to gloss over in silence our stance and our initiatives.

Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko also reiterated that it was our country that unilaterally assumed the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. This was a decisive and brave step that met with understanding and support among the widest circles of international public opinion.

Finally, it was our country and its allies and friends that proposed the initiative for concluding an agreement between NATO and the Warsaw Pact on the nonuse of nuclear weapons or conventional armaments against each other. In other words, an agreement on the nonuse of force in interstate relations.

The important and constructive nature of these proposals, as well as of the other peace-loving initiatives of our country, is more than evident. As Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko pointed out, in the presence of a will to preserve the peace there are -- and there can be -- no convincing arguments against the adoption of the Soviet initiatives.

U.S. 'Escalation in Lies'

[Agayants] In the light of the latest events the legitimate question arises: what about Washington; what about the other NATO countries? What is the reaction there? It is hard to believe that sensible people in the West can take seriously the verbiage coming from Ronald Reagan about the U.S. desire for peace, or his shrill statements about some Soviet threat. Do they not see here a blatant lie, just as in the well-advertized homily that the U.S. President delivered to the participants in the Orlando conference of the National Association of Evangelicals? The world is full of sin and evil. The Holy Scriptures and our Lord Jesus Christ enjoin us to fight against these with all our might, the master of the White House cried out with pathos, lifting his eyes unto the hills.

What astounding hypocrisy. It is quite obvious that in viewing the world through the prism of their imperial ambitions, the present crusaders in Washington are clearly relying on solving the most important international problems through unceremonious diktat and the use of crude force.

[Beglov] Our listeners probably know already that the U.S. President has recently literally swamped his fellow citizens with words on the subject of U.S. military policy, claiming that he is proposing some initiatives toward disarmament.

There has been a hitch, however. As a result of these speeches and proposals, even in the United States itself and in the camp of its allies not only were people not pacified but, on the contrary, people are sounding the alarm more loudly than ever before. I can quote Joseph Kraft, an American observer, who suggested his own explanation for this development. In his view, the President's past career as an actor apparently serves as an excuse for the head of the U.S. Administration to transfer the highly important issue of disarmament into the world of fantasy. In effect, attempts are being made to turn the talks into a theatrical stage. Joseph Kraft says that the friends of the United States have begun to feel frightened by this peculiar notion, even more so than the U.S. opponents.

What is hidden behind this paradox? How is it possible to be so clever as to talk about disarmament and yet make people even more apprehensive about the actions and words of those who currently determine the fortunes of American policies? Comrade Andropov's replies to questions put to him by a PRAVDA correspondent contain the most accurate key to unlocking this mystery.

The point, indeed the whole point of these speeches, is to secure trillions of dollars for new kinds of weapons. THE WASHINGTON POST calls this a crusade for acquiring new kinds of armaments. In order to pull the wool over people's eyes the most unsavory means are being used with the purpose of distorting the policies of the Soviet Union. The MORNING STAR in Britain found a most accurate and evocative comparison for these policies, saying that lies have become the fuel for American missiles.

Thus there is every reason to say that the White House requests for new kinds of weapons and the equally preposterous fabrications about a so-called lagging behind by the United States in the military sphere have gone so much beyond reason that common-sense is beginning to rebel against all this as a blatant deviation from the norm.

[Kornilov] The trouble, Spartak Ivanovich, is that this deviation from the norm, or more precisely, this escalation in lies, has been characteristic of American policies over a very long period, virtually since the speeding up of the arms race began. It is worthwhile returning once again to the facts about who was first in this race and when. In 1945 the United States was the first to create atomic weapons and to use them against the peaceful inhabitants of Hiroshima and Nagasake. In 1952 it was Washington who first carried out a thermo-nuclear explosion. In 1960 the first American, I stress, American submarine equipped with ballistic missiles went into service. The Soviet Union began building its submarine missile carriers only 4 years later. In 1970 it was the United States that began equipping its intercontinental ballistic missiles with multiple warheads. And indeed former U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger now himself admits, in retrospect, that it was these multiple charge warheads that immediately destroyed the nuclear balance.

[Beglov] However Yuriy Emmanuilovich, it was again Kissinger who, together with everyone else, advocated in his time that the United States should have the lead in the so-called multiple warheads. Now, however, Kissinger admits: The era of the multiple warheads spelled doom for the approach toward limiting strategic armaments. We may note that the Soviet Union began deploying analogous systems only in 1975. Afterward it was the turn of neutron weapons. It was the United States that started its production. And now it is the turn of long-range cruise missiles. Here the United States intends to deploy more than 12,000 of these missiles against the Soviet Union.

U.S. ABM Plans Decried

Finally, let us look at Reagan's latest idea about developing an antimissile defense system in space. This calls for special discussion as it is an idea that aroused alarm in the world from the very beginning.

[Agayants] The following quotation, Spartak Ivanovich, which I have taken from THE TIMES newspaper, may serve as confirmation of that. The paper wrote a day or two ago that President Reagan's decision to embark on developing antimissile installations has been seen by many military observers as horrifying and eccentric. Even this London paper that has become used to the escapades of the present Washington administration has been forced to admit that this is going too far. It notes that U.S. public opinion undoubtedly will come out against the costly new arms program that Reagan is proposing. THE TIMES observes that the U.S. President's speech seems likely to alarm rather than satisfy the U.S. allies since the peoples of the world are calling for the arms race to be stopped, not escalated.

[Beglov] Indeed. Let us return again to the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on limitation of antimissile defense systems, which was signed in 1972 and is still in force. This, after all, is not just an agreement to call a mutual halt to the development of a particular type of weapon but it is part of the base on which we began to build the entire structure of the strategic arms reduction talks. There the key element is recognition of partiy, of the principle of equality and equal security. Take away just one block from that structure, including the agreement on limiting antimissile defense systems, and the whole structure will begin to crumble.

If Kissinger admits the ominous role of the U.S. leap with multiple warheads in the fate of the SALT II treaty, then the flight of fancy that Reagan is permitting himself about an antimissile screen in space is capable of dealing a similar blow to the already existing agreements on strategic arms limitation. Finally, there is another important aspect: the apprehension of all mankind about the militarization of space -- the first signs of which have been manifested in the series of U.S. shuttle flights of the U.S. military program. Yet 2 years ago, be it noted, in 1981 -- the year that President Reagan took up office -- the Soviet Union put forward a proposal to ban all weapons in space.

Who, then, is blocking the examination of this question? Regrettably, we must acknowledge that, again, it is the United States. Their latest actions, including Reagan's star wars speech, as U.S. observers have called it, have only reinforced people's fears as to where the threats of a militarization of space realiy come from.

U.S. Interim Arms Proposals

[Agayants] A recurrent pattern seems to have been discernible for some time, one that is certainly characteristic of the actions of the present Washington administration. This was emphasized once again by Comrade Gromyko at his press conference yesterday. This is that an irresponsible, frivolous and unpredictable foreign policy is always accompanied by lies, falsification, the obvious juggling of facts and unscrupulous methods. Piling one untruth on another, seasoning it with fictions about a mythical Soviet threat and calls for a crusade against communism, bourgeois propaganda pours out this malodorous brew onto the heads of ordinary people both in the United States itself and abroad.

It is extremely difficult at times for the unsophisticated person in the West to know what is really going on. But, of course, Washington's overriding task is precisely that: to try to mislead and deceive the public in order to go on pursuing its dangerous policy of military preparations on the brink of war. The Pax Americana or peace American-style is the cherished dream of the most aggressive reactionary circles in the United States. For the sake of this dream the master of the White House himself, caught up in his campaign of blackmail and threats, spares neither words nor energy.

The latest example of this is his April 1 speech in which he put forward an allegedly new, so-called interim initiative on medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe.

[Kornilov] Yes, as far as the so-called interim options that are being put forward in Washington, its so-called new proposals on nuclear armaments in Europe, are concerned, these are, to be blunt, dishonest proposals. Analyzing them and laying bare their essential nature, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, emphasized with complete justification at his press conference, for example, that the U.S. President, when he refers to the correlation of forces on the Continent of Europe, leaves to one side, as important a component as U.S. aircraft that are carriers of nuclear weapons.

It is relevant to recall in this connection that none other than the United States possesses aircraft carriers that represent a serious force that cannot possibly be excluded when discussing the balance of nuclear armaments in Europe.

Washington is also unwilling -- persistently unwilling -- to count the medium-range weapons at the disposal of Britain and France, NATO allies of the United States. Yet these weapons are part of the joint forces of the ATlantic bloc and not to take them into account is frivolous, to say the least. Finally -- last but not least -- they say in Washington that it is not enough to reduce the number of Soviet missiles in Europe. The Soviet missiles of the relevant class in Asia must also be abolished. Yet who is unaware of the ring of military bases with which the United States has encircled our country? Who does not know that the U.S. missiles situated at those bases can cover the whole of Siberia, and even Taymyr? So is not the Soviet Union entitled to take steps to safeguard its security in that region, too? Of course it is.

In short, from whatever angle you approach the so-called interim option put forward by Reagan that is now so flamboyantly and, I would say, clamorously being publicized in the United States and in the capitals of some of the other Western countries that are NATO allies of the United States it is entirely obvious that this option is aimed not at achieving agreement in Geneva but, on the contrary, at blocking all possibility of agreement on a vital problem, on thesolution of which depends both what our old Continent of Europe will look like tomorrow and the future of peace and disarmament as a whole.

[Beglov] Indeed, Reagan's proposal -- and foreign observers are noting this -- cannot be regarded as constructive. It cannot have any influence on the course of the talks in Geneva since the words of the U.S. President are addressed specifically to the NATO partners of the United States with the object of quelling the wave of antiwar demonstrations in those countries and not to the Soviet Union. This notorious interim option does not guarantee for the Soviet Union -- or all of Europe -- the same level of security that the United States enjoys today.

[Agayants] Spartak Ivanovich, I am sure many of our listeners would certainly be interested to know what sort of reception Reagan's latest statement about the so-called interim option in the sphere of European nuclear armaments has received. Its point, after all, is to allow the United States to do what they mainly want to do: Start deploying their Pershing II missiles and cruise missiles in Western Europe. Taking international reactions to this proposal as an example, one can clearly discern that the more speeches the U.S. President makes on military subjects the less enthusiasm they arouse and the more the broad public receives them with watchful apprehensiveness and alarm.

[Beglov] Yes, Nikolay Ivanovich. There are, perhaps, two things one should single out in the present case. First, all observers immediately, even before the official reaction from Moscow appeared, began to comment that there is really nothing serious in these proposals that could be examined at the talks in Geneva with the Soviet Union. In other words, the speech was clearly aimed at the Western audience. But, to recall the simile used by one observer to the effect that Reagan has decided to turn the business of the talks into a stage, the public is being shown an amazing trick on that stage: The President waves his hand and causes both the U.S. and the Anglo-French arsenal in Europe to disappear up his sleeve and turn into zero.

In short, all are unanimous in noting, first of all, this very fact, namely that Reagan's so-called interim option -- and the French, British and West German papers are all saying this -- excludes both the U.S. bombers in Europe, numbering over 700, and the Anglo-French weapons, including 162 missiles belonging to those countries from the general balance of medium-range nuclear forces.

Another matter worthy of being noted is that Washington continues to demonstrate total unwillingness to stop. Reagan seems to be saying to his allies: Let me introduce into Europe at least some of the missiles that we intended to deploy and with every new dose of ungraded armaments, we will put pressure on the Russians. It is bad enough that they want to push through the zero option in this way, in stages as it were. But the main point is that insofar as even one new missile of the Pershing II type creates a new strategic situation, Washington thereby exposes its design of procuring positions for itself for a so-called limited, meaning European, nuclear war at all costs.

This means, and it was shown well in the Soviet Government statement and during the press conference by Comrade Gromyko, that the U.S. crusade for rearmament threatens not only the Soviet Union and its socialist allies but the whole of Europe as well. It is a U.S. threat to Europe and the whole world, a threat that needs to be rebuffed by all realistically minded people together and by public circles and governments in particular.

[Agayants] It is important also to mention the sociopolitical backdrop against which the Washington administration is trying to achieve its ends in Europe. This backdrop is characterized first and foremost by a fresh upsurge in the antiwar and antimissile movement which, particularly in Western Europe, is developing over a broad front at the present time into a spring offensive. Last Friday in Britain about 40,000 peace champions formed a human chain over 20 kilometers long stretching from the Greenham Common missile base to the Burghfield ordnance factory. In France there will be a 2-month peace campaign in April and May. Mass peace demonstrations against the deployment of new U.S. missiles in Western Europe are taking place in the FRG, Italy and other countries. In the United States itself the inhabitants of more than 400 cities and districts throughout the country have joined the movement for a freeze of nuclear arsenals. All this is vivid and convincing proof of the broad international public reaction to Washington's line of an unrestrained spiralling of the arms race and its attempts, through the so-called zero or (?interim) option, to turn Europe into its nuclear hostage.

U.S.-Israel Cooperation Scored

[Kornilov] The aggressive and essentially hegemonistic trend in U.S. foreign policy can be seen clearly today not only in Europe but in other parts of the world, too -- first and foremost Latin America and the Near East. From the Near East, where the situation is already dangerously critical, more and more alarming reports are coming in which indicate that Israel, which with the consent of the United States is consolidating its hold on the occupied land of long-suffering Lebanon, is at the same time sharply stepping up its military preparations for carrying out a bandit strike against Syria that is now the chief obstacle to the implementation of Tel Aviv's aggressive designs. Moreover, Tel Aviv now, as it has done more than once in the past, is attempting to justify its aggressive plans by referring to its alleged "concern" for the protection of its own security and is using as a pretext the exclusively defensive measures that Syria has taken in the face of the growing Zionist threats.

[Agayants] While we are on the subject of protecting people's security in the Near East, it is more than obvious that it is not the Israeli aggressor who needs such protection but those Arab countries against which the arrows of its aggression are directed. But this is the aspect of this question that I would like to stress. Although we have said, and with complete justification, that it is Israel that is preparing a bandit strike against Syria, it is quite evident that the plans for this aggression are being drawn up not only in Tel Aviv but also in Wasington. It is far from accidental -- and this was particularly emphasized in the Soviet Government statement issued a few days ago -- that the increase in the anti-Syrian militarist fervor in Israel is being accompanied by an expansion in U.S. political, military and financial aid to its partner. Literally just a few days ago Washington announced the despatch of a new, large arms consignment to Israel.

[Beglov] The following fact could be quoted to illustrate how closely the United States and Israel collaborate hand in hand in the Near East. When U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger was asked whether Washington would be signing an agreement with Israel on exchanging intelligence information, he just shrugged his shoulders and replied: We have hundreds of them there. We have at least 24 agreements with Israel. Now, as is reported from Washington, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz is engaged in laying the groundwork for even closer military and political cooperation between the two states.

[Kornilov] Political adventurism, the occupation of Arab territories, military aggression against sovereign Lebanon, tens of thousands of killed and wounded civilians, the bloody massacre in the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila, violence and torture in Ansar and other concentration camps: The responsibility for all these evil deeds lies not only with the Israeli ruling clique and the leaders of international Zionism. The Washington politicians, too, bear full responsibility for all this.

You may recall what Armand Lanoux, the French writer and publicist, wrote a few years ago about Israel: Israel is shaped like a dagger. Who is it that holds the hilt? It is now obvious to the whole world that the hilt of the Zionist dagger is in the hands of the Reagan team and the predatory U.S. oil monopolies who are striving to turn the Near East into an area reserved for brazen imperialist plunder.

[Agayants] To sum up our talk today I should like to say the following. Preventing a nuclear catastrophe and consolidating peace on earth is the common platform of mankind that unites all antiwar forces today. It is championed resolutely and consistently by millions of people in the fraternal countries of the socialist community. All honest and healthy-minded people in the world stand up for these humane aims against the dangerous actions of the imperialist instigators of war. The forces of peace are stronger than the forces of war. That fact is indisputable. But success in curbing the arms race, in reducing international tension and in switching from suspicion to trust and from confrontation to cooperation depends on the cohesion of the forces of peace. It is only by the joint efforts of all peoples in all states that a firm obstacle may be put on the path of the instigators of war. The supreme task of our time, as a recent PRAVDA editorial noted, is to strengthen the barrier across the path of the enemeies of peace. It is the solution of this task to which the efforts of the Soviet people, who have been educated by our Leninist party in a spirit of profound devotion to the cause of peace, are devoted. There we end our program. Thank you, comrades, for listening, and goodbye.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD011847 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 1 Apr 83

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by all-union radio foreign policy commentator Yevgeniy Kachanov, with TASS political observer Gennadiy Arkadiyevich Shishkin, international affairs journalist Eduard Vasiliyevich Kovalev and doctor of economics Igor Petrovich Belyayev]

U.S. on 'Hopeless Path'

[Excerpts] [Kachanov] In the 2 weeks which have elapsed since the last International Situation -- Questions and Answers program, we received quite a few letters, the authors of which express serious anxiety at the continuing growth in the U.S. military potential and the fresh and unprecedented arms manufacturing programs proclaimed by President Reagan. (Grigoriy Gavrilovich Mokryy) from Yevpatoriya, (Aleksina Petrovna Usova) from the town of Turga in Kemerovo Oblast, Comrade (Ruptsov) from Vologda Oblast, (Boris Andreyevich Zhilkin) from the village of Sredniy Raskhovets in Kursk Oblast, and others write to us about this. At the same time, our listeners turn their attention to the replies to a PRAVDA correspondent given by Yuriy Valdimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which contain a principally important exposition of the Soviet Union's position on urgent issues of disarmament and the Soviet evaluation of the foreign policy course of the American Administration which is dangerous for all peoples and the entire human race. We shall discuss this today with TASS political observer Gennadiy Arkadiyevich Shishkin. Over to you, Gennadiy Arkadiyevich.

[Shishkin] Comrade Andropov exposed to the whole world the unscrupulous methods to which the U.S. President resorts in his attempts to distort the policy of the Soviet Union and justify the development of more and more new variants of nuclear war. The policy of the American Administration is founded upon a great lie [lozh] which has through the centuries served militarists of all hues, namely -- if you want peace, prepare for war. Relying on this false motto, the Reagan administration proclaims from the rooftops that the increase in U.S. military might serves the cause of peace. The American President repeats this very same lie when he declares that readiness for war is the most effective means of preserving peace.

Yet however impardonably the White House distorts the Soviet Union's policy, and whatever unscrupulous means they adopt to do this, the fact remains: It is the United States which has launched out upon the hopeless path of pursuing illusory military superiority. In its very first year in power, the Reagan administration, according to UPI, devised a blood-chilling plan for rearming America in preparation for achieving a victory in a protracted nuclear war against the Soviet Union.

On 1 March this year, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger signed this top-secret document, which has been further developed and which is termed a directive for construction of the armed forces for 1985-89 fiscal years. As THE NEW YORK TIMES reports, this integrates the plans for utilizing medium and long-range weapons, and new emphasis is placed on the use of chemical weapons and the development of exotic types of weapons operated by various forms of energy, in particular high-energy lasers, particle rays and high power microwaves. This entire collection of means of mass destruction is today crowned by the program put forward by President Reagan for the development of broad-ranging and highly effective antimissile defense.

[Kachanov] Thus, Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, in spite of the fact that Washington's new undertaking is dressed up in defensive phraseology, there is no doubt that what is involved is a continuation of the old line. They are evidently relying on the effort to break the military-strategic parity and to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and deprive it of the capability of inflicting a retaliatory strike in the event of nuclear aggression.

[Shishkin] It was in precisely this way that the decision by President Reagan was evaluated throughout the world. Even the particularly pro-American British newspaper THE FINANCIAL TIMES mocks the American President's attempts to make out that the United States intends to give its nuclear strategy a defensive character. If a great power creates an effective missile defense, the newspaper writes, it will perhaps believe in its capability of inflicting a strike without fear of a retaliatory strike. And this means that any attempt to acquire such a system is evidence of aggressiveness of policy. Reagan's new strategy and his fierce anti-Sovietism, the newspaper adds, not only open up new channels for the arms race, but also undermine the whole basis of negotiations on achieving arms control with the Soviet Union. All people of common sense in the world took seriously our party general secretary's warning when he declared: The present U.S. Administration is continuing to proceed along an extremely dangerous path. One must not take such an irresponsible attitude to issues of war and peace. All vain attempts to achieve military superiority over the USSR are futile. The Soviet Union will never permit this. It will never be defenseless in the face of any threat. May they learn that well in Washington. It is time that they stopped inventing there more and more new ways of best unleasing nuclear war, in the hope of winning it. Such a venture is not merely irresponsible, it is also madness.

The awareness of this indisputable truth is increasingly frequently breaking its way through even the palisade of anti-Soviet propaganda in the United States. Thus, the renowned U.S. political figure Warnke, refuting the Reagan Administration's fantastic and dangerous illusions, recalls that it is not 1945 now, and that we can no longer inflict an effective strategic blow in the sure conviction that the enemy will not be able to repay this in kind. Another American figure, former U.S. ambassador to the USSR Watson, also stresses that it would be a delusion to hope that we might be able to frighten the Soviet Union, or that through increasing military expenditure we would compel it to bow before us, or, if not, that we could conduct a nuclear war and achieve victory in it. Even the American bourgeois press is starting to write about the groundlessness and complete alienation from life of the White House's adventurist calculations. Thus, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR states: Talk about achieving American superiority and ideas about a limited nuclear war derive from dangerous short-sightedness. As the lessons of history bear witness, in the period what has elapsed since World War II, the Soviet Union has always, sooner or later, eliminated any lagging on its part behind the American side in the sphere of technology. The sole realistic answer consists in preserving the approximate parity of strategic forces and in persistent and consistent negotiations on reducing arms.

[Kachanov] This is in fact the very course that the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community are proposing.

[Shishkin] At the Geneva negotiations the Soviet Union put forward constructive proposals aimed at limiting and reducing both strategic weapons and nuclear medium-range means in Europe. The USSR's new peace initiatives have received the active support of the peoples, as have the specific proposals put forward by the Warsaw Pact member states at the Prague conference. The complex of foreign policy initiatives of the socialist countries has been received by the world public as a realistic alternative to the policy of increasing arms unleashed by the United States and its allies.

The Warsaw Pact countries' proposals and the constructive realistic initiatives put forward by Comrade Andropov have met with a wide response in all countries precisely because they are founded upon the rejection of nuclear weapons use and of the first strike doctrine. Inspired by this example, the peoples are increasingly determinedly taking the cause of preserving peace into their own hands. Stepping over social, professional, age and other barriers, the broad antiwar movement is in many countries truly becoming a nationwide phenomenon and is turning into a new and influential political force. The peace treaty, which traditionally united the most progressive strata, today includes such representatives of the ruling elite as highly placed state officials, military leaders, churchmen, scientists, cultural and artistic figures and businessmen. Members of socialist, social democratic and liberal parties, of women's organizations, trade unions, members of the environmental protection movement and so forth have actively joined in antiwar demonstrations.

Many sober-minded people in West Europe consider that the Reagan administration is committing a serious mistake in ignoring the growing antiwar movement, alleging that it is the creation of Moscow. Thus, the influential London newspaper OBSERVER warns in an editorial article: Reagan would be making a serious mistake in assuming that West Europe may now permit itself less insistently to demand that negotiations be held with the Russians on arms control. Commenting that the abyss between the two shores of the Atlantic remains wide open, the newspaper stresses that it was precisely the Reagan administration's tough approach to Moscow that undermined the Europeans' confidence and provoked the strongest antinuclear movement in West Europe and the United States.

All this indicates one thing: The forces of peace are mightier than the forces of war. Everything depends upon their unity and purposefulness of action. As the Soviet Union tirelessly emphasizes, a reliable barrier across the path of the instigators of war can be erected only through the joint efforts of all peace-loving states and people and the entire antiwar movement.

Israeli-Syrian Relations

[Kachanov] A listener, (Shteynburg) from Moscow asks questions about the Near East. They are addressed to Igor Petrovich Belyayev, doctor of economics, who is a permanent participant in our broadcasts. He is with us now in the studio. Here is one of the questions. We are asked to compare the area and density of population of four countries of the region -- Israel, Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. Well, Igor Petrovich, one only needs to pick up a reference book for this. Israel has an area of about 14,000 sq km within the borders of the UN decision of 1947; its population density is 284 people per sq km. Lebanon has an area of about 10,500 sq km and a population of about 3 million. Consequently the density is slightly below 300 people per sq km. Syria has an area of 185,000 sq km and a population of about 10 million; its density is 56 people per sq km. And finally Jordan: area--95,000 sq km of which almost 7,000 is occupied by Israel; population -- 2.3 million; the density is the lowest of those under consideration -- 24 people per sq km. There are the data of these Near Eastern countries today.

[Belyayev] What can one say about these objective data? Of course, the area and average density of population and the size of population are different. But behind them I can get the feel of the specific geographical situation, as one might say. For example, a considerable part of the territory of Syria and a very large part of the territory of Jordan is desert.

But if one tries to understand the meaning of the question, then I see in it yet another motive to allege that the high population density in Israel creates some sort of difficulties for it, in particular with the territories which it is essential to take over to live in. For, Israeli expansionism is often explained by these geographic factors.

As far as the Arab countries are concerned, it alleges, they have enough area and their populations are not large and, therefore allegedly, the Palestinian refugees can be totally naturalized in the specific Arab countries. It seems to me that if one goes over to stating the question in the way that can be felt in listener (Shteynburg)'s question one could go as far as the Lebensraum theory which was demanded by Hitler as he began World War II in Europe. It seems to me that all these sorts of attempts to explain Israel's expansion by saying that the Israeli population has not enough land to hold all of those who would like to live in Israel -- all of this is bankrupt from beginning to end and we reject in principle such a statement of the question.

[Kachanov] Our listener asks another question and writes: The construction by the Israelis of a radar tower on Mount Baruk -- this is a well-known fact -- is undoubtedly aggression, she writes, but a necessary aggression justified by the history of the Jews and their position among hostile Arab countries. What can be said about this question?

[Belayayev] Well, first of all, what is necessary aggression and what is aggression in general? Aggression cannot be divided into necessary and unnecessary. Aggression is aggression. As far as Israel's claim to have is radar station on Mount Baruk is concerned, this claim is rejected by the Lebanese Government. As far as I see it, there are absolutely no grounds to insist on this demand. Mount Baruk is situated on the territory of Lebanon and whether or not there should be an Israeli radar station on it is a question to be decided by the Lebanese Government. Its position is very clear and very correct. This is real aggression and any sort of qualification by such words as "necessary" aggression is only, as far as I understand it, an attempt to mask the essence of aggression and to present it to the peoples of the world as something dictated, allegedly, by some sort of objective necessity.

[Kachanov] Igor Petrovich, what do the Arabs know of the fate of the Jews in Europe in the years preceding the World War II and during the war -- this question is asked by Comrade (Shteynburg). She writes that they are probably not very interested in this.

[Belyayev] The Arabs know quite a lot about the history of the Jews and I maintain that they know it well. Well, for illustration, it is sufficient to recall that during World War II a considerable number of Jews who had fled from persecution by the Hitlerites were accepted in Palestine and found salvation on the territory of Palestine. At that time Palestine was a mandate territory by the way, and the population of Palestine welcomed the Jews from Europe not only joyfully but as victims of Fascism. And in this sense, as far as I can see, there is no justification for thinking that the Arabs were in any way indifferent observers of everything that was going on on the European Continent. Moreover, when, after World War II, and even now, when the question has been raised about the persecution by the Hitlerites of the Jewish population of European countries, the Arabs' sympathy has always been on the side of the Jews. Moreover, they have not only been sympathetic but have always protested against everything that was perpetrated during the World War II on the territory of German and other European countries with regard to the Jews.

Historically, the way everything turned out was that in the Near East the Jews lived side by side in Jerusalem and Palestine. And had it not been for the British policy in the mandate Palestine, had it not been for the whipping up of Jewish-Arab discord including by Zionist organizations, had it not been for the war which, even before the creation of the state of Israel, the Jewish nationalists began on the territory of Palestine against the native Arab population, it could well have been that the Israel-Arab conflict which we now, so to say, observe in all its many-sided and complicated nature -- it could well be that it might not have existed at all.

[Kachanov] I would now like to go over to a somewhat different theme. In recent weeks there have been increasing reports appearing about the preparations being made by Israel and the United States for aggression against Syria. That is, after the actions in Lebanon they are preparing for the same with regard to Syria, as can now be seen.

[Balyayev] It is well known that on 30 March the Soviet Government made a statement directly concerned with the situation around Syria in the Near East. This statement contains certain very important, I would say, theses which stress the essence of what is happening. Well, first of all, the question of Syria's security. For the weapons which have been deployed on the territory of the Syrian Arab Republic are defensive weapons and they cannot be used in any way for offensive actions. Moreover, the Syrian leadership over the past few months has not made a single aggressive statement which might have evidenced any aggressive intentions on the part of Syria towards Israel. Further, I would like to point attention to what is stressed in the Soviet Government's statement. It is a question of the attempts being made now by Israel and the United States to crush Syria as the main obstacle to the implementation of their plans. It is a question of the Reagan plan and in practice, if one extracts the concrete contents from it, it is a question of attempts to establish U.S.-Israel domination in the Near East. Here we have the military presence of Israel and the United States and attempts to establish military-political control of the entire region from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf. We also have what we call the elaboration, so to speak, of the strategic accord between Tel Aviv and Washington. And here we see, if you like, the global ambitions of Israel and the United States.

There are two specific things to which the Soviet Government's statement points attention. These are the unprecedented demands by Israel to leave the deserter Major Haddad as the master of the fate of southern Lebanon. He is in practice an Israeli puppet. And further, there is everything that is now being stated by Israeli political and military leaders and rather curious statements are being made. Well, for example, Moshe Arens talks of a prophylactic strike. This is something new. This is not just a preventive, preemptive strike. This is, if you like, a strike which as it were, is thought out in advance and is carried out in order allegedly to prevent something. This is, you know, something like a whole theory when the time of the strike, the aim of the strike and everything connected with the political consequences of some action or other is chosen by Tel Aviv, agreed by Washington, and acts according to a clearly defined recipe. Thus Moshe Arens, who now heads the Defense Ministry, ordered that all Israeli troops on the borders with Syria be put in a state of combat readiness. Moreover, he ordered that the Air Force units assigned to take part in the operation should be ready to fulfill this same program of prophylactic measures of which he spoke.

[Kachanov] Igor Petrovich, I recall that a few days ago there was a statement by the present chief of the general staff of the Israeli Army, Eytan -- true he is to retire soon -- that Israel, he said, would not begin a war against Syria if there were not subsequent actions on the part of Syria or the Palestinians based on the territory of Syria. I have the impression that this Israel is waiting for a pretext or perhaps is even preparing this pretext. Well, we know that many wars have begun, that is were arranged, by some sort of deliberate provocations and then large-scale wars have begun.

[Belyayev] You know, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, it seems to me that the top Israeli military officials have now appointed roles among themselves. I have also read what Eytan said and I drew the conclusion from this that it is possible that the Israeli Army will engage in creating one of the pretexts you referred to.

I have before me a recent statement by the new chief of general staff who take office on 15 April, that is in 2 weeks. I am referring to General Moshe Levi. He said that the Israeli Army is ready for war in the spring of this year or at any other time of the year since it is the duty of the Israeli Defense forces to be ready for any turn of events. Further, he said more specifically that in the spring of this year a blow might be struck against Syria. True, he immediately took a step back: he said that it is possible that a war would not start. But, nonetheless, he has already designated the contours as one might say, of a possible attack.

If two military officials at such a high level in Israel are talking, one of a prophylactic strike, another of war, a third that a war might not happen, then, in brief, one must be on the alert. And it is to this that the Soviet Government's statement calls attention. But the Soviet Government also calls attention to the fact that the United States is now acting with Israel. Thus, just recently the American delivered to Israel 200 Sidewinder missiles which can be used for an attack on Syria. Again, as the Soviet Government's statement points out, Washington has announced the supply of a large new consignment of arms to Israel. It is also intended to supply an additional consignment of the most modern F-16 and F-15 fighter-bombers.

Consequently, we are correct to say that today Israel and the United States are acting in a united front against Syria, and that means against calm in the Near East.

But there is another thing which is important. It seems to me that this whole bundle of measures against Syria aimed at intimidating it is being undertaken with yet another aim -- to threaten someone else with the fate of being put in harness with the United States and Israel. This section of the statement by the Soviet Government, I think, disposes one to very serious thought about the situation around many Arab countries including those directly bordering on Israel. I think that now Arab public opinion will pay attention to this warning from the Soviet Government. And finally -- I think that today the whole world is thinking and talking about this -- the Soviet Government stressed in its statement that Israel's criminal plans toward Syria cannot leave anyone indifferent and must be thwarted. The Syrian people are not alone; the Arab patriots, the socialist countries and all who cherish the cause of peace, justice and honor are on their side.

[Kachanov] Thank you, Igor Petrovich.

Greek Internal, Foreign Affairs

[Kachanov] Our listener Chernenko from Kiev asks us to explain the reasons for the exacerbation of the present situation in Greece. We shall ask Eduard Vasiliyevich Kovalev, international affairs journalist, to reply to this question. Eduardo Vasiliyevich, please.

[Kovalev] Judging from reports in the foreign press, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, the political situation in Greece has noticeably worsened recently. There has been a sharp deterioration in relations between the government of socialist Prime Minister Papandreou and the center-right opposition. Antigovernment propaganda even asserts that normal dialogue between them has become virtually impossible. In these conditions Papandreou has been obliged in the past few days to appeal to the political parties to maintain a healthy political climate and not to permit a further worsening of the situation. However, his appeal was not heeded. Passions became so heated that at a meeting of the Parliament, the deputies, who to start with did not spare insulting expressions against each other, in the end grappled with each other in hand to hand fighting which has not happened for many years.

The superficial reasons for the confrontation that has arisen between the government and the opposition can be found in two recent events: First, the rumors circulating at the end of February about an unsuccessful attempt at an antigovernmental coup d'etat; and secondly, the murder in mid-March of Athanassiadhes, owner and editor of the extreme right-wing Athens newspaper VRADINI. The New Democracy opposition party which adheres to center-right views tried to present these events as evidence of the alleged total inability of the government, its incapability of ruling the country and of guaranteeing order and calm to the population.

[Kachanov] But what are the real reasons for the exacerbating of the situation in the country? What are the deep-lying motives for the actions of the reactionary forces both in Greece and abroad?

[Kovalev] You know, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, these are not conjectures about an antigovernmental military coup of feigned indignation at the murder of a right-wing journalist. In fact, the right-wing political forces and the reactionary circles of major monoply capital acting behind the scenes are alarmed at the progressive steps taken by the Papandreou government in internal and foreign policy. They fear that his government will be able to consolidate its positions and strengthen its influence among the people and will be able to carry out a number of democratic changes in the political and social-economic life of Greece that were promised to the electors.

Papandreou's opponents would like to use for their own interests the difficulties that still exist in the economy. Thus, for example, Averof, leader of the New Democracy Party, speaking on Athens television, criticized the government's internal and foreign policy. Speaking of the country's economic position, Averof laid all the responsibility for its deterioration on Papandreou's Cabinet and on the prime minister personally. Moreover, the New Democracy leader attacked the government for adopting a position that is different from that adopted by the majority of NATO countries with regard to the events in Afghanistan and Poland, for coming out against the so-called U.S. sanctions, and against the deployment of new U.S. missiles in West Europe which, allegedly, undermines the West's common policy.

[Kachanov] Well, we know that particular dissatisfaction was aroused among the rightwingers by the improvement in recent months in Soviet-Greek relations and the development of trade between our countries and the first steps toward achieving mutual understanding in the political sphere.

[Kovalev] The rightwing press stepped up the campaign against the Papandreou Government immediately after the successful Soviet-Greek talks in Athens in the second half of February when Nikolay Aleksandrovich Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, made a state visit there.

This campaign also received support in the West. Even during Comrade Tikhonov's visit to Athens, the official organs of the European Economic Community accused Greece of, unwarrantedly and without informing the community, concluding a long-term agreement with the USSR on trade and economic cooperation that allegedly infringed the interests of Greece's partners. The United States and NATO were also displeased with the way Greece behaved at the talks with the USSR. Matters went so far that for the U.S. State Department sent an official memorandum to the Greek Foreign Ministry, which expressed concern about the development of Soviet-Greek relations and Greece's support for the peace initiatives put forward by the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries. What can we say here? The Papandreou Government's striving to conduct an independent and autonomous foreign policy in accordance with the undertakings given to the elections constantly comes up against strong opposition from the United States and other NATO countries, which do everything to put the recalcritrant Greeks in their place.

The American ally, and this must be said quite frankly, without any particular standing on ceremony uses against Greece various forms of concealed and open pressure including such levers as delaying the granting of promised economic and military aid and using the fact that there are U.S. military bases located on Greek territory.

[Kachanov] Thank you, Eduard Vasiliyevich. We still have letters in which listeners ask about the course of the U.S.-Greek talks on the problem of military sites on Greek territory. It is known that Papandreou's socialist government stated from the very start its intention to eliminate gradually the U.S. military presence in its country. I think that we will dwell on this question in the following broadcast.

ANDROPOV ACCEPTS INVITATION TO VISIT INDIA

OW311407 Hong Kong AFP in English 1354 GMT 31 Mar 83

[Text] New Delhi, March 31 (AFP) -- The Soviet leader, Yuriy Andropov has accepted in principle an invitation from Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to visit India, it was stated in Parliament today.

Foreign Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao told the lower house the visit was expected to take place at a mutually convenient date.

GROMYKO MEETS WITH DRA'S DOST IN MOSCOW 1 APR

LD011311 Moscow TASS in English 1300 GMT 1 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, today received Shah Mohammad Dost, member of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, minister of foreign affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, who has made a stopover in Moscow.

Views on some questions of bilateral relations between the USSR and the DRA and on other questions of mutual interest to the sides were discussed during the conversation that passed in a warm, comradely atmosphere.

Later in the day Andrey Gromyko held a luncheon in honour of Shah Mohammad Dost. The ministers exchanged friendly toasts at the luncheon.

Dost Departs for Buenos Aires

LD032047 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1950 GMT 3 Apr 83

[Text] Shah Mohammad Dost, member of the PDPA Central Committee and foreign minister of the DRA, left Moscow on 3 April for Buenos Aires.

HUNGARIAN PAPER INTERVIEWS AUCCTU'S SHALAYEV

AU311019 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 29 Mar 83 p 3

[Interview with Stepan Shalayev, chairman of the USSR All-union Central Council of Trade Union [AUCCTU] who was on a visit to Hungary 20-26 March: "Our relations are based on reliable foundations: Statement by Soviet Trade Union Council Chairman Stepan Shalayev"]

[Text] At the invitation of the National Trade Union Council, a delegation of the Soviet All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] visited our country from 20 to 26 March. The delegation was led by Stepan Shalayev, chairman of the Trade Union Council. He granted an interview to NEPSZAVA prior to the delegation's departure.

[Question] What are the current tasks of the Soviet trade unions?

[Answer] To enhance in many ways -- under CPSU guidance -- the role of the trade unions in the further development of communist construction and their contribution to and responsibility for that development -- in general, in this way, could one formulate the central lines of our activity. Of course, this is an extensive and multifaceted process and, as the saying goes, it cannot be put into a couple of words. Therefore, I will try to explain its most important aspects.

The Soviet trade unions directly participate in the elaboration and implementation of the measures that ensure the fulfillment of the CPSU's socioeconomic program in the current 5-year plan and in the eighties. The tasks related to this were laid down by the 18th Trade Union Congress last March. Following the congress, we elaborated and adopted complex, specific-purpose programs in conformity with the main guidelines for trade union activity.

Such programs constitute something new in the activity of our trade unions. They enable us to improve the long-term and continuous planning of trade union work and to coordinate better the activity of basic organizations and trade union organs and make it more meaningful on every level.

One of the first programs we have adopted deals with the methodological perfecting of the inclusion of the working people in the macromanagement of production. In this, we proposed, among other things, measures intended to ensure that the role of collective contracts, workers' meetings and permanent production conferences increase and that the mass technical creative activity of the working people expand. We have elaborated a separate program for a broader application of the brigade form of work organization and stimulation and counterplans. At the same time, we have adopted a plan which is now being implemented on the means by which the trade unions can contribute to the implementation of the Soviet Union's Food Program.

We continue to give preferential treatment to aspects of the effectiveness and educational function of socialist competition. At the moment, 110,000 million working people are participating in the socialist work competition. The successful fulfillment of the pledges made on the 65th anniversary of the Great October and the 60th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Union has enabled us to successfully implement our country's 1982 Plan of Economic and Social Development.

The working people of Moscow, the republics, and the oblasts have made additional and greater pledges for this year. Increasingly, the socialist competition is being concentrated on the improvement of efficiency and quality; acceleration of scientific and technological progress; and thriftier use of labor, our materials, and energy reserves.

Our trade unions pay great attention to resolving issues related to the working and living conditions and recreation of the working people. We can mention here the perfecting of the wage system of workers and employees, the apportionment and use of social consumption funds, the system of social insurance and pension allocations, the system of sanitariums and recreation centers, and the improvement of working conditions and labor safety, as well as health and cultural allocations for the working people.

Striving continuously to curb physical work, manual work, we began this year to implement complex measures that define tasks, concretely broken down per sectors of the people's economy, in this area. We have worked out and are implementing a trade union program to ensure that workers, kolkhoz peasants, and employees receive better supplies of work clothing, working shoes, and other individual items for labor safety. In past years, we have greatly improved the housing conditions of the families of workers and employees in our country. The number of children's centers has increased. Services have improved.

As for cultural-educational activity, I would like to stress that the Soviet trade unions are playing a responsible role in successfully accomplishing the integration of the entire economic training system of the working people with production and educational work. Of course, the Soviet people's patriotic-internationalist ideological education remains our task. We are devoting great attention to harmoniously attuning the aforementioned work to moral education and to ensuring that the working people, primarily youth, can spend their leisure time creatively.

The aforementioned issues are also applicable for our country's trade unions today.

Along with all this, the Soviet trade union council and the Soviet trade unions are proceeding from the premise that the implementation of the measures, that have been outlined to improve working and living conditions further increase wages and incomes and raise the standard of living and cultural allocations of the working people, are feasible only on the basis of a constant further development of the people's economy, acceleration of scientific and technological progress, improvement of work productivity, realization of savings measures in every area, and improvement of the quality of products.

This is the essence of the dual task, repeatedly stressed by our 18th congress, of the Soviet trade unions.

[Question] What is your opinion of Hungarian-Soviet trade union relations and the prospects for their development?

[Answer] First, I would like to stress that Soviet-Hungarian trade union relations are based on reliable foundations. The identical nature of the fundamental interests and objectives of our peoples, the consistent policy of the CPSU and the MSZMP to extensively develop relations between the two countries, the strengthening of the indissoluble friendship between the Soviet and the Hungarian people, and the CPSU's and MSZMP's constant attention to trade union activity, which is conducted in the interests of the working people of our countries -- these constitute the foundation.

In our talks with leaders of the National Trade Union Council, our appraisal of the relations was uniform. The "Agreement On the Further Development of Cooperation between the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union and Hungary," concluded in March 1979 between the two trade union centers, is being continuously implemented. The effectiveness of relations is increasing and we are putting additional and much more successful forms of cooperation into effect.

The fundamental functions and tasks of the trade unions are identical in the socialist countries. For that very reason, studying the experiences gathered by the fraternal countries' trade unions is of great significance and utilizing them in our own work is important. We are also interested in various aspects of the activity of the Hungarian trade unions in the production, economic, and social spheres alike. These are, for instance, the participation of your trade unions in the development of the movement to economize on materials, raw materials, and energy; your attitude on the solution of social matters by observing the interests of all working people; and your contribution to the development of the household farms operating on a contractual basis with the agricultural sector.

The significance of the direct relations that have developed between similar enterprise workers' collectives or linked through cooperative deliveries is increasing at the rate of the development of the socialist economic integration. It must be stressed that such a relationship already exists between the collectives of many Soviet and Hungarian enterprises. At our visit to the Debrecen antifriction bearings plant and following the inspection of the Budapest Ikarus bus factory, the members of our delegation were able to see for themselves once more that such contacts foster a successful accomplishment of production-technological tasks, and, at the same time, constitute a joint contribution to the further strengthening of friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Hungarian People's Republic. In our opinion, we must continue to expand direct relations between the two countries' collectives of workers and draw vanguard workers and trade union activists more extensively into trade union cooperation.

At our talks at the National Trade Union Council, we also stressed other possibilities for intensifying and perfecting our cooperation. We fully agree with the Hungarian comrades that we must further enhance the effectiveness of the forms of bilateral relations so that they will yield optimal advantage in the accomplishment of the tasks facing the trade unions of the Soviet Union and Hungary. In our opinion, we should avail ourselves more actively of the means of multilateral cooperation among the trade unions of the fraternal socialist countries as well, which is already in effect, for all practical purposes, in all major aspects of our activity today. We feel that the exchange of views we have had with leaders of the National Trade Union Council in this respect will give new impetus to the development of Soviet-Hungarian fraternal trade union relations and cooperation.

[Question] How do you appraise the situation that has now developed in the international trade union movement?

[Answer] First, I would like to stress that the Soviet Trade Union Council and the National Trade Union Council have a uniform opinion on this issue as well. This is convincingly borne out, among other things, by our discussions with National Trade Union Council leaders. We attach primary significance to the development of the prevailing fraternal relations between the trade unions of the socialist community and exert joint efforts to promote a strengthening of the unity of the world trade union movement on a class and anti-imperialist basis. At the same time, we are also aware of the difficulties that have continued to grow worse in recent years because of the deterioration of the international political atmosphere.

The forces of imperialism and reaction led by the United States want to thrust the peoples into the abyss of hostility and military confrontation. These same forces want to provoke a return to the cold war in the trade union movement as well. They hamper cooperation between trade unions with different international orientations, primarily in the struggle being waged for peace, disarmament and a continuation of detente.

It is common knowlege that the countries of the socialist community constitute the vanguard of the struggle for the peace and security of peoples. A realistic alternative to a nuclear world catastrophe was put forth in several specific peace initiatives by the Soviet Union and the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact countries adopted in Prague last January. To preserve and strengthen peace, it is extremely important for the NATO countries, to whom these peace initiatives are addressed, to study them carefully, objectively, and responsibly, without wasting time, before they make a final decision on the deployment of the new U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Western Europe.

We are convinced that both the working people and trade unions of Western Europe are vitally interested in halting the arms race and preserving peace. The existing differences of opinion on certain issues should not and must not prevent contacts between trade unions with different orientations because these relations primarily signify the vital interests of the working people.

We, on our part, are prepared to further develop our existing relations with the trade unions of the capitalist countries to strengthen the peace struggle, among other things.

The Soviet trade unions remain in solidarity with the working people and peoples of the liberated countries, with the struggle they are waging against the forces of imperialism and reaction for their complete political and economic independence. We attach great significance to the development of our cooperation with the trade unions of the aforementioned countries and we help and support them.

The Soviet Union's trade unions actively participate in the work of the WFTU, which has functioned and continues to function as a militant international class organization of the working people. The 10th trade union world congress in Havana convincingly proved the appeal of the objectives and practical activity proclaimed by the WFTU. The world federation's activity concerning the struggle for peace, against the arms race and the antiworker policy of the transnational corporations, and for the creation of a new world economic order is of tremendous significance. In the future, as before, the Soviet Union's trade unions intend to contribute to perfecting the WFTU work, to a consistent implementation of the resolutions of the Havana world congress and to strengthen concerted action by the international trade union movement on an anti-imperialist class basis, the chairman of the Soviet trade union council concluded his statement.

ARKHIPOV CONFERS WITH HUNGARY'S MARJAI

PM011205 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talk Held"]

[Text] I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received J. Marjai, deputy chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, 28 March and had a talk with him, with the participation of S. Rajnai, Hungarian ambassador to the USSR.

ZAGLADIN HOLDS BUDAPEST TALKS WITH KADAR, OTHERS

LD022035 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 2 Apr 83

[Text] At the invitation of the MSZMP Central Committee, Comrade Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee, and first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, visited Budapest from 30 March to 2 April. He was received by Kadar, first secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee and also by Aczel, member of the Politburo and secretary of the party Central Committee.

Talks were held between Comrade Zagladin and Varkonyi, secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee and Szuros, director of the International Relations Department of the Central Committee on topical questions concerning cooperation between the two parties, and the international communist and workers' movement.

WEST EUROPEAN REACTION TO REAGAN PROPOSAL NOTED

LD040850 Moscow TASS in English 0751 GMT 4 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS -- PRAVDA draws attention in today's review of international affairs to the fact that "Margaret Thatcher was virtually the only one to have approved the White House's new militarist plans for anti-missile weapon systems", although in her own Defence Ministry, according to the newspaper, they caused "mixed feelings."

As for the "interim proposal," PRAVDA writes, the NATO leaders, who had been warned one week in advance about the step Washington was going to take, were prevented by the burden of Atlantic "solidarity" and will-o-the-wisp hopes for NATO's military superiority from straightening up and taking a look around.

London, for instance, is preoccupied with its attempts to dampen the anti-war movement in Britain by all means, be it by repression, by the establishment of a special secret governmental group to concert actions against peace campaigners or by passing off the "interim proposal" as a sign of Washington's "flexibility."

"The broader sections of the West German population are extremely worried by the plans to turn the territory of the country into a launching site for the Pentagon's missiles," PRAVDA continues. "In this sense much responsibility is vested in the coalition government formed in Bonn the other day which is again led by CDU [Christian Democratic Union] chairman Helmut Kohl. Judging by Bonn's official statements, as far as missiles go, it tries to please the Pentagon rather than to facilitate the achievement of a mutually acceptable agreement in Geneva. This, in particular, is illustrated by Bonn's support for the interim proposal. Meanwhile, major political and public forces in West Germany, just like in neighbouring Belgium and other countries, demand ever stronger the renunciation of missile deployments under any conditions and continued talks for the achievement of a positive result. The aspirations of people of goodwill are expressed anew nowadays in mass-scale spring peace marches."

USSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS CONGRATULATES KOHL

PM011201 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 83 Morning Edition p 3

[Text] To his excellency Herr Helmut Kohl, chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany

Our congratulations on your election as chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany.

We express the hope that relations between the Soviet Union and the FRG will continue to develop on the basis of the Moscow Treaty and other agreements in the interests of a peaceful future for our peoples and of containing the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and in the interests of consolidating world peace.

USSR Council of Ministers

BRIEFS

CPSU DELEGATION IN LUXEMBOURG -- Luxembourg March 29 TASS -- a CPSU delegation for exchange of experience of work led by G. Sizov, chairman of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, arrived here at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Luxembourg. At the airport the CPSU delegation was welcomed by Rene Urbany, chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg, and other party leaders. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2200 GMT 28 Mar 83 LD]

ZAMBIA'S KUANDA COMMENTS ON REAGAN MEETING

LD310932 Moscow TASS in English 0821 GMT 31 Mar 83

[Text] Washington March 31 TASS -- United States President Ronald Reagan and Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda, who is visiting here met in the White House yesterday.

Their meeting revealed sharp differences between Washington and Lusaka, especially in the approach to the situation in the south of African Continent and a solution to the Namibian problem. Addressing correspondents after the talks, Kenneth Kaunda expressed "disgust" at the policy of apartheid pursued by the South African regime. The President of Zambia stressed the need of the earliest possible end to the apartheid system; and of the extreme seriousness of the Namibian problem, and the pressing necessity of its solution on the basis of United Nations Security Council Resolution Number 435.

As for the United States, whose President was prattling about his "desire" to see Namibia "free and independent", in fact Washington together with a number of Western countries only obstructs a solution to the problem. Proceeding from its own strategic schemes and the interests of the American monopolies, the United States is developing economic, political, and military cooperation with the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa and thus encourages it to acts of aggression against neighbouring African states.

ZIMBABWE, PLO ESTABLISH DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

LD310145 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 30 Mar 83

[Text] Moscow March 30 TASS -- TASS commentator Boris Bogdanov writes:

The establishment of diplomatic relations at ambassadorial level between the Republic of Zimbabwe and the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) has become a new evidence of independent Africa's solidarity with the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for its rights against the Israeli occupiers. An agreement to this effect, signed in the Zimbabwean capital, emphasizes that this act is called upon to seal the ties of friendship which link the two peoples.

The PLO already has diplomatic representations in Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and many other African states which hold a consistent stand on the Middle East problem. An overwhelming majority of the member states of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) demand that Israeli troops be withdrawn from all occupied Arab territories, and that the inalienable right of the people of Palestine to establish a sovereign state of its own be ensured.

The Zimbabwean Government's decision to open a PLO diplomatic representation in Harare has been taken at the height of a large-scale political offensive on Africa, offensive launched by Tel Aviv and Washington with a view to introducing the Zionist regime into the African Continent.

TASS, CAMEROON PRESS SIGN EXCHANGE AGREEMENT

PM311141 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Agreement Signed"]

[Text] An agreement on the exchange of information between TASS and the Cameroon Society for Press and Publishinghas been signed in Yaounde. The document also envisages the training of Cameroon specialists in the communications sphere.

AUTHOR SENTENCED FOR ANTI-SOVIET SLANDER

LD011819 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 1 Apr 83

[Text] Moscow April 1 TASS -- The court trial of Zoya Krakhmalnikova came to a close here today. The trial, which was presided over by Vasiliy Romanov, a deputy chairman of the city People's Court, found Zoya Krakhmalnikova guilty of having illegally engaged since 1976 in the preparation of the anti-Soviet slanderous collection NADEZHDA.

It was established in the course of the trial that the materials of this collection were sent by clandestine channels abroad where they were printed in large editions by the publishing house "Pose" of the People's Labour Alliance. Then the collection was circulated in a number of Western countries. The anti-Soviet circles, who incited Zoya Krakhmalnikova to her activities, also made attempts to smuggle a considerable part of the collection's editions back into the Soviet Union.

Presenting them as "research papers" on history, religion and philosophy, NADEZHDA published articles, which showed a crudely distorted picture of Soviet reality and defamed the USSR.

In accordance with Part 1 of Article 70 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic Zoya Krakhmalnikova was sentenced to one year in prison.

NONFERROUS METALLURGY MINISTER ON PRESS CRITICISM

PM032203 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 19 Mar 83 p 1

[O. Buzluk report: "A Sector and the Press"]

[Text] Since the beginning of 1983 the newspapers PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, TRUD, and others have devoted about 200 articles to the development problems of the country's nonferrous metallurgy industry and to the competition among the sector's working people to fulfill the 5-year plan targets ahead of schedule. This figure was cited by P. Lomako, the sector minister, in his speech to a session of the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy collegium devoted to enhancing the effectiveness of press articles. He pointed out that newspaper articles offer considerable help to economic leaders and specialists by exposing specific shortcomings in the work of enterprises and organizations, and by illuminating the experience of pacesetting collectives.

As a rule, the ministry apparatus, industrial associations, and enterprises examine critical signals from the press with attention. The requisite measures for eliminating shortcomings are taken. An efficient, businesslike response to criticism is characteristic of the Soyuzpolimetall and Soyuztsvetmetobrabotka all-union production associations. But the Soyuzalyuminy and Soyuznikel associations and the Kazakh SSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy, the collegium noted, are giving still little attention to these questions. Systematic analysis of articles devoted to dependent enterprises has not been instituted everywhere.

The collegium adopted a resolution which obliges ministry apparatus staff and leaders of sector enterprises and organizations to respond to press articles in a prompt and businesslike way.

GAS INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT, PROGRESS DISCUSSED

Tasks, Shortcomings Highlighted

PM301157 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 83 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Gas Industry"]

[Excerpts] Nature has generously endowed our motherland with its riches. The Soviet economy is totally based on its own resources. In outlining the plans for the eighties the 26th CPSU Congress set the task of ensuring the accelerated development of work on a geological study of the country's territory and on increasing the proven stocks of mineral and raw material resources, particularly fuel and energy resources.

Natural gas is an important constituent part of these resources. Its share in the total volume of the country's fuel consumption approaches 30 percent. Gas is now used in the smelting of more than nine-tenths of all steel and cast iron, and in 60 percent of cement production. The use of natural gas as a chemical raw material in the production of nitrogenous fertilizers yields high national economic efficiency.

Special feature of the gas industry in recent years has been the broad introduction of highly efficient technological processes and modular-unitized automated equipment of large unit capacity. The comprehensive utilization of gas is being implemented increasingly widely. The point is that a number of fields contain other valuable components. Highly efficient gas chemical enterprises for the thorough processing of the extracted raw material have been set up for this purpose in Orenburg region and Uzbekistan. A weighty contribution to the development of the gas industry is being made by the workers of the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises and other construction ministries. Enterprises of the Ministries of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building; of Power Machine Building; of the Aviation Industry; of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems; and of a number of other ministeries are participating in the retooling of the sector.

More and more ultralong gas pipelines are lining the Tyumen north fields with the central and other regions of the country. This is why it is necessary to ensure the timely and comprehensive equipping of these fields and to carry out drilling and construction operations more rapidly. Meanwhile, the equipping of the Urengoy field is still clearly behind schedule. Last year, instead of three comprehensive gas preparation installations only one was commissioned, and that with 6 months' delay. There was only a two-thirds fulfillment of the total plan for the commissioning of the interfield gas collecting mains, and only 50 percent of boreholes have been linked up with installations preparing the gas for transportation. Housing, social, and cultural projects are being built only slowly. It is necessary to impose order in this sphere, too, without delay.

Each cubic meter of natural gas is obtained at considerable cost in the country's northern fields. The costs of its extraction and transportation can be reduced given the more active expansion of the network of roads and electric power supply lines. Nevertheless, the Ministries of Transport Construction and Railways have allowed a significant lag in the construction on interfield motor vehicle roads, railways, and water transportation projects. The subdivisions of the RSFSR Ministry of the River fleet are not completely fulfilling their plans for freight shipment to the north.

In order to ensure the incessant growth of the flow of the raw material from Urengoy, the 1983 task of organizations under the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry enterprises is to bring into action four powerful installations for the comprehensive preparation of gas, and lay no less than 200 km of gas pipelines for borehole linkage and 220 km of interfield gas collectors.

The Ministry of Transport Construction must commission 90 km of hard-surface roads, and the Ministry of Power and Electrification must commission all planned electric power supply lines, including the Lep-500 sector between the Surgut Gress and Urengoy. Much work remains to be done also at the Urengoy Gress. The construction season in the north is short, and this is why it is important to exploit each day to the utmost. The equipment, pipes, cement, and other materials must be delivered to the boreholes and construction sites earlier.

Also ahead of us is the development of the Yamburg field which, together with Urengoy, will be the main supplier of gas for the national economy in the coming years. This is why it is important for the central planning organs to speed up the solution of questions relating to the construction of roads and railways in this region.

The party committees in ministries participating in the gas industry's development and the local party organizations are called upon to constantly monitor the progress of work on the fulfillment of Ministry of Gas Industry orders. Special attention must be given not only to the growth of quantitative indicators and the unconditional fulfillment of delivery plans, but also to ensuring that the economic and social aspect of the matter is kept in mind; to reducing the costs of gas extraction and transportation, and to improving the housing and service facilities for workers in this sector. It is necessary to intensify control over the quality of construction work and not to allow overexpenditure of fuel, power, and material resources. This will be helped by the development of competition between related sectors and the broad dissemination of the experience of the best subdivisions.

Official on Plan Fulfillment

LD300220 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 29 Mar 83

[Text] The gas industry fulfilled the plan for the first quarter today. Yevgeniya Konstantinovna Selikhova, head of the Economic Planning Administration and member of the collegium of the USSR Ministry of the Gas Industry comments on this.

[Begin recording] [Selikhova] Gas industry, one of the most important industries of the fuel industry, continues to develop at a fast pace. Over the past 3 months 134.5 billion cubic meters of the valuable fuel and chemical raw material have been extracted in the fields of the country. By way of comparison let me say that this is more than was extracted in all of 1965. Moreover, the growth in comparison to the same period last year has amounted to 9.5 billion cubic meters and 2.8 billion cubic meters out of this quantity was extracted above plan.

Plan tasks are being exceeded practically by all the country's gas extracting regions. Toilers of the Tyumen Oblast, as in past years, have obtained the best results. They make up the main increase in gas extraction in the country. Turkmen gas extraction workers, likewise, obtained the best results.

I would like to quote several more figures which bear witness to the stable and regular work of the industry. Over the past 3 months, tasks concerning the growth of labor productivity have been overfulfilled by 1.4 times. Moreover, some R30 million worth of output has been marketed above plan more than R30 million were obtained by way of above plan profit.

[Unidentified reporter] Yevgeniya Konstantinovna, how do related enterprises help you? After all, the rate of development of the gas industry depends to a considerable extent upon the work they do.

[Answer] The quantities of gas to be extracted in Western Siberia and above all in the Urengoy Deposit are so great that what is required is more active work by many ministries and departments.

Economic results of the Tyumengazprom association and of the ministry as a whole would have been considerably higher if the related enterprises of ours had put the deposits [obustraivali] in good order in time, if they had built roads, electric power transmission lines, docks and ports, and carried out housing construction in time.

Calculations show that we spend a much greater quantity of means on temporary and winter roads than on motor vehicle roads with hard surface. Had roads of this kind been built we could have spent 10 to 15 percent less on drilling new wells and putting deposits in good order [obustroystvo]. This is tantamount to saving hundreds of millions of rubles. The fact that we do not possess a reliable system for centralized power supply costs us dearly, too. After all, currently gas deposits, compressor stations, and residential areas receive their power supplies, in the main, from small portable electric power stations. Thousands of people are engaged on servicing these. Creating good living conditions for West Siberian workers is of important significance as well. However, here too, not all is well. The plans for housing construction and construction of cultural and consumer facilities have failed to be fulfilled year in and year out. [end recording]

BRIEFS

FERROUS METALLURGY, OIL PLAN -- Workers of the ferrous metallurgy and oil industry fulfilled their first quarterly plan. About 300,000 tons of steel, almost 250,000 tons of rolled metal, more than 20,000 tons of pipes including large-diamter pipes for arterial gas pipelines have been produced above plan. Oil workers produced 600,000 tons of oil and gas condensate above plan. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 31 Mar 83 LD]